DCCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 617 VT 008 836

TITLE	RESEARCH IN CORRECTIONAL REHABILITIATION.
INSTITUTION	JOINT COMMISSION ON CORRECTIONAL MANPOWER AND TRAINING, WASHINGTON, D.C.; REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (DHEW), WASHINGTON, D.C.
PUB DATE	DEC 67
NOTE	77P.; REPORT PRESENTED AT A SEMINAR (WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 6-7, 1967)
AVAILABLE FROM	JOINT COMMISSION ON CORRECTIONAL MANPOWER AND TRAINING, 1522 K STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.95
DESCRIPTORS	ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS, COLLEGE COOPERATION, *CONFERENCE REPORTS, *CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION, ETHICAL VALUES, LEGAL PROBLEMS, PROGRAM EVALUATION, REHABILITATION, *RESEARCH, SPEECHES

ABSTRACT

FORTY-THREE LEADERS IN CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION PARTICIPATED IN THE SEMINAR PLANNED TO PROVIDE AN INDICATION OF THE STATUS OF RESEARCH IN CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION. PAPERS INCLUDE: (1) "PROGRAM TRENDS IN CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION" BY JOHN P. CONRAD, (2) "FEDERAL OFFENDERS RAHABILITATION PROGRAM" BY PERCY B. BELL AND MERLYN MATHEWS, (3) "ALCOHOLIC OFFENDER REHABILITATION PROJECT" BY MILTON K. DAVIS, (4) "PLASTIC SURGERY PROGRAM FOR REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS" BY WALLACE MANDELL, (5) "A COOPERATIVE PROGRAM FOR ALLEVIATION OF JUVENILE BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS" BY GLEN K. WALLACE, (6) "CURRENT INFORMATION BASIS FOR EVALUATING CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS" BY DON M. GOTTFREDSON, (7) "ETHICAL AND LEGAL ISSUES IN EXPERIMENTATION WITH OFFENDER POPULATION" BY GILBERT GEIS, AND (8) "TESTABILITY OF CORRECTIONAL GOALS" BY CLARENCE C. SHERWOOD. BRIEF PRESENTATIONS BY FOUR CORRECTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS OF THEIR VIEWS ON RESEARCH IN CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION ARE ALSO INCLUDED. "MANPOWER AND TRAINING IMPLICATIONS OF THE SEMINAR" BY RUDY SANFILIPPO AND JO WALLAH INCLUDE: (1) DEVELOPMENT OF FAVORABLE ADMINISTRATIVE CLIMATE FOR CONDUCTING EVALUATION RESEARCH, (2) DEVELOPMENT OF WELL CONCEIVED RESEARCH PROGRAMS ALONG WITH REALISTIC STAFFING PATTERNS, AND (3) ASSISTANCE TO ACTION AGENCIES IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. (JK)

ED036617

RESEARCH IN CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION

JOINT COMMISSION
ON
CORRECTIONAL MANPOWER
AND TRAINING

The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, incorporated in the District of Columbia, consists of nearly a hundred national, international, and regional organizations and public agencies which have joined together to attack one of the serious social problems of our day: How to secure enough trained men and women to bring about the rehabilitation of offenders through our correctional systems and thus prevent further delinquency and crime.

Recognizing the importance of this problem, the Congress in 1965 passed the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act, which authorizes the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to make grants for a broad study of correctional manpower and training. The Joint Commission is funded under this Act and through grants from private foundations, organizations, and individuals.

Commission publications available:

Differences That Make the Difference, papers of a seminar on implications of cultural differences for corrections. August 1967, 64 pp. Second printing November 1967.

Targets for In-Service Training, papers of a seminar on in-service training. October 1967, 68 pp. Second printing November 1967.

Research in Correctional Rehabilitation, report of a seminar on research in correctional rehabilitation. December 1967, 70 pp. Second printing March 1968.

The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections, report of a public opinion survey. February 1968, 28 pp. Second printing March 1968.

ED036617

RESEARCH IN CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION

Report of a Seminar
Convened in Washington, D. C.
July 6-7, 1967 by the
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration
and the Joint Commission on Correctional
Manpower and Training

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Joint Commission on Correctional
Manpower and Training
1522 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

December 1967

FOREWORD

Today research plays an increasingly important role in many concerns of mankind, from the common cold to outer space. Indeed, some critics maintain that we have emphasized the accumulation of knowledge at the expense of action.

However, readers of this report will conclude that research has not been overemphasized in one area that is of deep concern to the American public — the rehabilitation of public offenders. In fact, two themes stand out in these pages: (1) that very little research is being done in corrections; and (2) that there is little agreement on what correctional rehabilitation actually is.

To shed some light on the situation, two agencies with special concern for correctional rehabilitation — the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (now Rehabilitation Services Administration) in the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare — convened a group of leading administrators and researchers in corrections and rehabilitation at a seminar to discuss this difficult and virtually untilled field.

These leaders had had no previous opportunity to explore together the complex issues of research in correctional rehabilitation, the testability of correctional goals, ethical and legal problems encountered in research on correctional rehabilitation, and administrative structures most promising for such research. Their papers and their frank discussion of problems are reported in the following pages.

If at times the participants sounded a discouraging note about the present situation, they faced mutual problems openly and agreed upon the need for increased efforts. The report of their deliberations points clearly to the necessity of greatly refining and expanding research in correctional rehabilitation.

Joint Commission staff responsible for planning the seminar were Rudy Sanfilippo, Jo Wallach, and Robert Fosen. VRA staff involved in planning were Nathan Ed Acree, William Flanigan, and Barbara Moriarty.

Publication of the report was the responsibility of the Joint Commission. Mr. Sanfilippo and Mrs. Wallach prepared the final section, which is drawn from the seminar discussions. The report was edited by Roma K. McNickle.

Both agencies express their thanks to the participants. Special thanks are due to E. B. Whitten, who chaired the seminar in his usual effective fashion.

The Joint Commission is pleased to present this report as the third of its seminar series.

WILLIAM T. ADAMS
Associate Director
Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training

CONTENTS

Page

OBJECTIVES OF THE SEMINAR 1
E. B. Whitten
Hon. Mary E. Switzer
Hon. Myrl E. Alexander

PROGRAM TRENDS IN CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION 6
John P. Conrad

CURRENT VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION RESEARCH IN CORRECTIONAL SETTINGS 13
Nathan Ed Acree
Percy B. Bell and Merlyn Matthews
Milton K. Davis
Wallace Mandell
Glen K. Wallace

CURRENT INFORMATION BASES FOR EVALUATING CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS 28
Don M. Gottfredson

ETHICAL AND LEGAL ISSUES IN EXPERIMENTATION WITH OFFENDER POPULATIONS 34
Gilbert Geis

THE TESTABILITY OF CORRECTIONAL GOALS 42
Clarence C. Sherwood

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES AND RESEARCH IN CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION 51
Kenneth Polk

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSPECTIVES ON RESEARCH IN CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION 56
Robert H. Fosen
Herman G. Moeller
Ben S. Meeker
Louie L. Wainwright
E. Preston Sharp

MANPOWER AND TRAINING IMPLICATIONS OF THE SEMINAR .. 65
Rudy Sanfilippo and Jo Wallach

Roster of Participants 70

REHABILITATION AND CORRECTIONS: OBJECTIVES OF THE SEMINAR

Opening Remarks by
E. B. Whitten
Executive Director
National Rehabilitation Association
Mary E. Switzer
Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation
Myrl E. Alexander
Director, U. S. Bureau of Prisons

Mr. Whitten:

As I think of my own experience with rehabilitation in connection with correctional programs, three vignettes come to my mind.

When I was director of the Mississippi vocational rehabilitation program about 20 years ago, one of our counselors resigned to take a challenging job as director of education and rehabilitation at the Mississippi state penitentiary. After about two years, he came to the conclusion that there is a world of difference between theoretical acceptance of an idea by the head of an institution and actually putting that idea in effect. He thought he was probably the only employee who had been hired with any thought whatsoever of rehabilitating the inmates. So he resigned in disgust. I believe it was another 10 or 15 years before anything else was done for rehabilitation in that institution.

A second memory is that of talking to a counselor in Colorado shortly after that state had begun its efforts to rehabilitate public offenders. He seemed very enthusiastic about what he was doing. But a few well-placed questions convinced me that there was a good deal of uncertainty in his mind about what he was doing and why he was doing it and to what effect.

A third instance stands out sharply in my mind because it is recent. I was talking to a psychologist in one of our state programs who had the responsibility to help screen inmates of a penitentiary for entry into a rehabilitation program that was sponsored jointly with an outside agency. He was astonished and shocked when he began to get letters threatening death to his wife and children. The letters, of course, were unsigned, but he attributed them to some prisoner who had been turned down for the rehabilitation program, which permitted a good deal more freedom than institution life.

For about a year now I have been vice president of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, one of the sponsors of this seminar today. In this connection I have been associated with some of the leaders in the field of correctional practice and others who are front runners in modern concepts of penology and corrections. I have come to understand how devoted

these men are to principles, how interested they are in trying to help the individuals committed to their care, how determined they are that public offenders will be rehabilitated if this can possibly be done.

As a result of all the experiences I have referred to, I have come to two or three conclusions which I pass on to you at the beginning of this meeting.

One is that undoubtedly, if we handle things right — and that is considerable "if" — if we handle things right, rehabilitation is going to be a key word in corrections. It is going to be the watchword. More than that, a great deal is going to be done about it.

The second conclusion I have reached is that the vocational rehabilitation agencies in this country and the vocational rehabilitation movement as a whole have the competence to make a very important contribution to corrections.

Third, neither the people in rehabilitation agencies nor those of the rehabilitation movement have a clear view as to exactly what their role should be in relation to corrections and in relation to other agencies in their correctional roles.

And fourth, a great deal of experimentation is going to have to be done before we can say that we have found the proper role of rehabilitation, and state rehabilitation agencies in particular, in the rehabilitation of the public offender.

The purpose of this meeting is to try to pull together what we know about research relating to rehabilitation in corrections and try to chart the way to additional research which will enable rehabilitation agencies and the rehabilitation movement to be of much greater service in effecting the rehabilitation of the public offender. Hence I believe this is an extremely important meeting, and I hope that together we shall have an interesting and helpful experience.

Miss Switzer:

It is with great pleasure that I welcome you to this seminar convened by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training. The primary objective of this meeting is to identify broad areas for research in correctional rehabilitation and to discuss ways in which this research can be stimulated and conducted. In addition, I would hope that by establishing the broad areas of need for correctional research, we in VRA will see more clearly our role in this field and thus channel our research effort into areas where it will do the most good.

Research in correctional rehabilitation can help to solve one of the most serious problems facing our society today. President Johnson recently stated: "Next to peace, the thing that is troubling our people more than anything else now is crime." Not the least troublesome aspect of the problem is our failure to reduce crime very much through our dealings with public offenders in prisons, training schools, probation, and parole, even though we spend over a billion dollars a year for this purpose. We need desperately to make our correctional system truly correctional. We must find out through carefully conducted research what works and what does not work to rehabilitate public offenders. Old and established programs, techniques, and concepts must be re-evaluated in terms of present requirements. Ineffective programs must be discarded. New programs must be developed and tested. Research and demonstration programs will help us to reach our goals.

VRA has been involved with the rehabilitation of public offenders for a number of years. Many of our state vocational rehabilitation agencies have taken on responsibilities for part of the work in bringing the public offender back into community life. We could expect that there would be problems in this kind of collaboration with correctional agencies. I am sure there are, and we in VRA need to understand them.

Two years ago, Congress gave VRA responsibility for a study of manpower and training for corrections. As you know, this study is being conducted by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training under a grant from VRA.

To advise us in administering this grant, we have had great help from the Advisory Council on Correctional Manpower. Many of its members are leaders in the field of corrections, and they have given us a resource we did not have before.

During the past two years, VRA institutes and seminars such as this one have been bringing together leading VRA and correctional administrators and educators for exchange of knowledge. Utilization of vocational rehabilitation services in correctional rehabilitation has spread rapidly throughout state programs.

A significant part of VRA's involvement in correctional rehabilitation is the support of research and demonstration projects. Since 1961, VRA has supported 34 such projects in which the adult or juvenile offender is the focus of service and/or study. In the past year, our expenditures for such projects have been about $1¼ million in federal funds.

One of the areas in which rehabilitation agencies can be of special help is in those correctional populations where there are striking characteristics — mental retardation, mental illness, physical disability, to name three — with which rehabilitation agencies have worked successfully over the years. It will be interesting to see whether we can separate out those offenders whose difficulties with the law may be due to some of these characteristics rather than to other factors.

Rehabilitation agencies do not, of course, have all the answers. Nor do we have what it takes to rehabilitate everybody. Therefore one important aspect of research should be to try to identify the kinds of situations and individuals that can effectively be handled by our agency and those that can be handled by another. Thus we in rehabilitation will be looking forward eagerly to the results of this seminar.

One of the foremost correctional researchers has referred to correctional research as "an elusive paradise." If this is so, it is time to capture this elusive paradise.

The Department of Defense, in a recent study of its research over the past 20 years, arrived at a central conclusion: All of its significant research during that time was developed from problems generated in the field.

We are applying the DOD conclusion in this seminar. Opportunity is being presented to the correctional field to generate worthwhile research. You who are participating in this seminar are leaders in the field. You administer broad programs of correctional rehabilitation, and you know the problems generated in your field. If anyone can accelerate entry into the elusive paradise of correctional research, it is you. We hope that in these two days you can identify broad areas for research in correctional rehabilitation. The challenge is yours.

Mr. Alexander:

I would like to help set the background for this meeting by giving you my impression of the situation in corrections today.

Somewhere in the *Confessions,* St. Augustine tells of his struggles when, as a gay young blade, he began to feel the need to change his ways. He tells us he used to pray: O Lord, make me good — but not yet.

To my mind, this describes the situation we have had in corrections for the last 20 or 25 years. We have wanted to succeed in intervening in delinquent and criminal careers. But we have been unwilling to give up the comfortable ways and the security of the legends, myths, and shibboleths that surrounded us.

Today there is a ferment, a stirring in corrections which seems to me to be a growing up, a maturation of our field. It is marked by real willingness to examine our work, to design new approaches that promise far greater effectiveness than we have had thus far, a willingness to examine the results with a critical eye. This calls for evaluation and for research.

The ferment in corrections is rising around the world. In the Philippines this winter I visited a penal colony where some 4,000 offenders are housed. Those who qualify may have their families come to live with them. Their children go to school with the children of the staff. Our own Peace Corps is providing teachers. I was especially interested in a rudimentary kind of post-release planning by which the state gives 20 to 25 acres to a man and his family. This is something new and different.

For three years I have sat on the ten-man United Nations Commission which has been studying the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders all over the world. There I talked with Dr. Lambo, the great psychiatrist of Nigeria. I asked him how one man could possibly carry on the practice of psychiatry in that vast country. He told us how he gathered the medicine men in the bush, putting on his tribal robes and paint, and taught them the principles of group psychotherapy.

I have also talked with Madame E. Dechnut, the holder of two earned Ph.D. degrees, whose life is dedicated to the problems of the women and children of India. Perhaps this is one of the most difficult and frustrating things to which any human being can dedicate a life. The situation is still impossible, but Madame Dechnut and her colleagues in Bombay and Calcutta are moving with hope and determination into something new.

One of the things we in corrections have learned in this new era is that we can't possibly mount our own resources in institutions and in community programs like probation and parole. Increasingly we recognize that we must play the role of catalyst in securing services. We must look to a great variety of resources to help us struggle with extreme problems of human behavior.

It is an exciting thing today to see the contributions which the vocational rehabilitation agencies are making to corrections. I think, for example, of a one-armed moonshiner we have had for the fourth time in one of our southern institutions. Whenever he was released, he had nothing to do but go back to the mountains and begin moonshining all over again. During his last stay, the rehabilitation people fitted him with a prosthesis and made a sheet metal worker out of him. He's a very good one, too. He has moved his family out of the mountains to Pensacola and is supporting them.

It was heartwarming to me last week when the Commissioner of Education asked the Attorney General to nominate one of our people for a place on the Advisory Board of the U. S. Office of Education. They have discovered that we are doing a lot of educational work.

Perhaps this interest and help from other agencies is one of the real hallmarks of the new era of corrections. Two hundred years ago the prison was created, a gigantic step forward from sending kids to the galleys for life for stealing apples. By the end of the next 100 years, the prison had fallen into disrepute. A great reform movement swept the country. The reformatory and the indeterminate sentence were created, and from the latter parole developed.

In the last couple of decades we have been introducing behavioral disciplines into the correctional process. Now we are saying: O Lord, make us good *now*.

In this conference we can explore methods and approaches to evaluating what we are now doing. The new policy and philosophy says: We must examine, we must evaluate, we must change as we search for new and better methods. Out of this, corrections, with the help of other agencies whose work is based on behavioral science, can develop methods which will successfully intervene in criminal and delinquent careers, particularly with youth and young adults. Thus we can carry out the mission with which the President charged us when he said that we will never successfully solve the problems of crime in this country until we can stop the revolving door of courts and prisons.

PROGRAM TRENDS IN CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION

John P. Conrad

As I understand my charge this morning, I am to review current trends in correctional rehabilitation as a basis for our consideration of the thorny problem of program evaluation. Thus I am in a pleasantly clear-cut domain of analysis. I shall describe the various classes of correctional programs and sit back for the remainder of our seminar to listen to my colleagues cope with the basic theory and methodology of evaluation processes. Needless to say, I hope to be helpful when I can and sympathetic when I can't.

The task which I have been set has been further delimited: I am to confine my review to those programs which I think may fall within the purview of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. In fact, this does not really simplify my problem. I shall take the position in this review that *nearly all correctional rehabilitation must involve vocational rehabilitation.* The point seems almost self-evident; but, at the risk of laboring the obvious, I want to buttress the position empirically and logically.

The Clientele To Be Rehabilitated

Let me begin with a broad statement of the facts concerning the clients whom corrections is trying to rehabilitate. Most crimes are committed by young people between the ages of 14 and 30. They form between 60 and 70 percent of the client population, depending on whose analysis of what data we use. Examination of this population always reveals a severely handicapped group drawn primarily from the most deprived sections of the comunity. It is by no means too much to say that the crime we worry about most as a nation is a mode of adjustment to life on the bottom in America. It is a mode of adjustment that cripples.

Most of those who adjust in this way are significantly limited in education. In California, with whose data I am most at home, the median education of institutionalized adult offenders is not quite at the ninth grade level. It is likely that the educational level of probationers is significantly higher; but I am unable to say how much higher, and I doubt that it alters the significance of the profile for our purposes.

In occupational terms this group is primarily unskilled, or semi-skilled at best. Work histories are fragmented by lay-offs, firings, or other separations from the job. The experience of unemployment or part-time employment is common, though how much more common than for the blue-collar population as a whole, I am unable to say. Vocational competence and continuity of employment are by no means unknown, but it is reasonable to say that these attributes are found in a minority of the cases.

It is a commonplace of correctional practitioners that these offenders as a group are not merely vocationally incompetent. They are criminally incompetent too. The evidence lies, of course, in the fact that they were caught, convicted, and committed. A review of their crimes shows that they tend to be poorly planned and even more poorly executed.

Mr. Conrad, formerly chief of the division of research in the California Department of Corrections, is now chief of research, Bureau of Prisons, U. S. Department of Justice.

The Nature of the Criminal Career

This is a group of boys and young men who have chosen criminal careers. I think it is worth while to consider briefly the nature of a criminal career, because I see the goal of corrections as the transfer of criminal careerists to conventional occupational careers. Correctional success should be measured in these positive terms, but the process of transfer is fraught with difficulties which must be described accurately if they are to be surmounted through correctional treatment programs.

As I see it, the most significant feature of a criminal career is that it is open to anyone. The skills and knowledge required at the entrance level are always limited, though seldom as limited as candidates for crime careers may think. Entrance to such careers usually depends on the unilateral decision of the individual. Except in the case of well-organized criminal gangs and syndicates, no application and qualification procedures need be negotiated. Increasing criminal competence will bring about increased opportunities for criminal gain, but even the marginally competent criminal can aspire to some success in the career he has chosen.

The criminal career places a low value on conventional occupational skills. Conventional moral worth is depreciated in favor of values which are compatible with criminal career success: toughness, loyalty, courage, skill at useful criminal knacks. The prevailing expression of contempt for "squares" exalts by implication an ideal of the criminal which few crime careerists are able to match in their daily lives, just as few Christians are able to meet the requirements of Christianity.

Much more should be said about the true nature of the criminal career. What needs to be added here is that there is an acceptance of the risks of sanctions — the humiliation in court and the degradation of confinement — as the price which must be paid for the blessings of autonomy. This seems to be the real pay-off for the confirmed criminal careerist. That the autonomy of criminality is largely an illusion is irrelevant for our purpose in examining the problem of rehabilitation and the means of solving that problem. Criminals are not the only Americans who wear themselves out in the pursuit of absurd illusions. Everyone knows from experience that unreal incentives can reinforce behavior just as effectively as the real and tangible incentives which spur other people on.

The Central Task of Correctional Rehabilitation

As I have already said, the task of correctional rehabilitation is the transfer of the criminal careerist to the pursuit of a conventional career. Traditionally minded correctional policy-makers have been content to state their goal more simply, when they thought in terms of goals at all. They considered that it should be enough to transform an offender into a non-offender. I consider this objective non-specific and, as such, not very meaningful. Nobody thinks of himself primarily as a non-offender, nor are there any prescriptions by which such a role can be attained or maintained. But when we induce this burglar or that car thief to make a commitment to a career as a factory drill-press operator or a body-and-fender repairman, we have completed processes which can be described and whose consequences can be measured.

For most of the people we are treating, the essence of the process would seem to be vocational rehabilitation, although this is by no means the whole answer. Where, as must always be the case with some clients, a definable process of vocational rehabilitation does not take place, the correctional

system should not claim success, even though the offender may not offend again. No process has been completed by the system which entitles it to claim that a change has taken place. In many such cases, we are face-to-face with behavior which, if it is not as destructive as crime, is burdensome to the community. Mental illness, chronic unemployment, chronic dependency are liabilities of a specially infectious nature. The correctional facility which merely prevents its clients from adopting other forms of social deviance because their inadequacies have not been corrected, will often have lost the last and best opportunity any agency will ever have to create social assets out of these men.

Approaches to Rehabilitation

There are essentially four conceptual approaches to the rehabilitation of criminals. Parenthentically, it should be stated that this classification is neither complete nor original. I am indebted to my colleague, Alfred Himelson, for the typology of treatment approaches which I am about to present. Although we have not exhausted all the possibilities, we have reached what I believe is a useful basis for understanding what happens when treatment succeeds or fails.

First, and evidently essential to all correctional processes, is the infliction of punishment. Like the Utilitarians, we assume that, if a man suffers pain as a consequence of an action, he will avoid repeating the action in order to avoid the resulting pain. Like all elderly hypotheses, this notion has acquired the status of law in spite of the lack of evidence and — worse still — the lack of doctrine differentiating practice in accordance with principles. Undoubtedly punishment prevents some recidivism, but we do not know how often or with what kinds of cases. What it does accomplish is to introduce a powerful influence which generally offsets motivation to benefit from any kind of treatment. It is a sort of constant which must be taken into account in planning any rehabilitative activity, but it is a constant which produces highly variable responses among those treated.

I think we in corrections are more sensitive than we used to be on this issue. We tend to assume that it is not our business to administer the punishment itself. We really mean it when we say that criminals are sent to us *as* punishment, not *for* punishment. Most correctional administrators seem to feel an obligation to assure that the negative effects of punishment will be offset as far as possible.

We have been preoccupied for at least 20 years with trying to devise some reliable form of psychological treatment of the offender. Here the assumption is that his condition resembles sickness. Two principal approaches to his cure are logical in the present state of the psychological arts. The first concentrates on the offender's status as an offender and the need for him to face the consequences of that status. Several fashionable doctrines ensue from this approach. We hear about "reality therapy," about community treatment of the "here-and-now" experience of correctional clients, and "guided group interaction" in which the focus is on mutual aid within the group toward the goal of "anti-delinquency." Much more can be said about these and other adjustive approaches, but the essence of each is that the client must adjust to the reality of his conduct and its consequences.

The second psychological approach is aimed at adjustment to society through the acquisition of insight or increased self-understanding. These approaches have been borrowed from the field of mental health and involve the use of psychiatric and social casework forms of intervention. Both group therapy and individual therapy models have been adapted for correctional use.

Because the focus is on the individual and his need for self-understanding, there has been much attention to the development of typologies and diagnostic differentiation.

It is to be noted that neither punishment nor reality treatment model has any special need for differentiation as now administered. In such successful research as has so far been conducted on the individual adjustment model, there has been a comprehensible — one might almost say predictable — correlation between motivation (or "treatability") and treatment outcome. But as to the evaluation of programs without such differentiation, significantly favorable data are conspicuous by their absence. It is therefore fashionable to accept the researcher's inability to report positive results. This leads to the assumption that the claims made by the treaters for success for their treatment have been greatly exaggerated. I think the evidence is still incomplete. The apparent success with some of the subtypes in the Community Treatment Project practice typology [1] offers a glimmering of hope that the adjustment model of treatment may yet be developed to the definition of successful methods which can be prescribed after diagnostic assessments have been made.

The third approach is the educational-vocational. Here we are on familiar ground for vocational rehabilitation. This approach focuses on the individual's need and capacity for increased occupational competence. Treatment is based on the teacher-pupil model rather than the doctor-patient model which the adjustive approach requires.

The fourth approach I shall refer to as normative. Here we assume that there is nothing wrong with the offender. He is *different* and should be valued accordingly. What he needs is non-delinquent values, which can in turn be gained by group acceptance of goals appropriate to the difference.

One example of this approach may be found in Synanon, the well-known California venture into the self-treatment of narcotics addiction. In Synanon, the only changes required of the client are abstention from narcotics and adherence to community mutual-aid values. His differences from others and his inadequacy to function independently in the community are accepted but dismissed as irrelevant to the achievement of drug-free living.

Another example of this kind of treatment philosophy might be the adaptation of slum gang forms and outlook — and sometimes the gangs themselves — to community organization and service. Such approaches as the San Francisco project, Youth For Service, and Legal Services to Youth, as developing in Chicago, would seem to fall under the normative approach.

In all such approaches, the delinquent transfers into a new and non-delinquent career, often into a career which never existed before. Persistence in behavior predicated on delinquent values is punished, but behavior which expresses new norms is rewarded with new and interesting roles as well as acceptance by a group of peers who understand and are attempting to achieve change by the same means.

Remedial Socialization

The common thread to these four approaches is remedial socialization. Orville Brim, who has given much attention to the problems of socialization after childhood, defines socialization as the process by which persons acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that make them more or less able members of society. We have all gone through experiences which have brought

[1] See Marguerite Q. Warren, *After Five Years: Report of the Community Treatment Project* (Sacramento: California Youth Authority, 1967).

about what I suppose we may congratulate ourselves upon as successful socialization. The process continues, as we know, throughout life. New roles played in new organizations, new group memberships, the accumulation of reinforcing experiences — all these experiences increase or diminish our ability to function as able members of society. With most of us, childhood socialization experiences were successful, at least to the extent of enabling us to function as useful members of the community.

In the recent history of corrections, we can identify two schools of thought which are apparently exclusive. (This is not to say that they are by nature antagonistic, as they have sometimes been in practice.) The first school has focused on the defective socialization of the correctional client in childhood. It has assumed that what he needs most is a remedy for his regressive and stunting childhood experiences. The focus on psychological treatment was the natural result. So was the belief that, if the formidable tasks of resocialization could really be accomplished, then vocational adjustment would be a simple enough matter, since many occupations are fairly simple nowadays.

The second school has focused on the educational deficit. Educators and their allies in industry are well aware that the criminal careerist has little or nothing to offer in the labor market. Until he can be made economically competent, there is no reason to expect that he will succeed in detaching himself from his commitment to criminality.

It is probably true that neither education alone nor psychological treatment alone is sufficient to produce remedial socialization. I do not know that a correctional commitment to comprehensive remedial socialization, in which we vigorously prepare for both psychological control and economic competence, will be significantly more effective than our present fragmented approach. But I suggest that, if we are going to increase effectiveness, we must be testing complete plans which recognize *all* the needs of the offender instead of just some of them. Remedial socialization must aim at complete socialization through means which are credible in concept and in execution. This objective is seldom met in present-day corrections.

The Instruments of Corrections

So far as we are concerned in this examination of the topic, there are two principal instruments by which correctional objectives are to be reached. These are: community-based corrections, the kinds of program which the vast majority of correctional clients experience; and institutional corrections, in which certain offenders are subjected to complete control. Variants on these two modes used to be few and unimaginative. They still are too infrequent, and we are far from a complete rationale for their use.

Nevertheless, the lines between community and institutional programs are blurring. Some offenders in the community, especially parolees, are given part-time institutional care in halfway houses. Others are in the community on work-release programs, in which they emerge from conventional prisons or jails for work only, returning to their cells at night. The reverse program has been suggested by some California authorities. Taking into account the marginal employability of many offenders, it has been proposed that correctional industry plants be made available on prison grounds for parolees who are living in the community but cannot find reliable work in the regular labor market.

Much is hoped for from these changes. There is a good deal of talk about decompression chambers for prison inmates who are thought to need a less

abrupt transition from the restrictions of the prison to the freedom of the community. Others refer with commendable satisfaction to the halfway-back experience, in which control of a shaky parolee or probationer is increased without total confinement in a prison or a jail.

There is indeed much to be hoped for from increased administrative flexibility, but flexibility is meaningless unless it is used to bring about a specific end through well-defined processes. It is here, I think, that a massive increase in vocational rehabilitation services will effectively augment our power to plan remedial socialization. Vocational counselors who are strategically deployed so that they can gauge the ability of the client to function as a productive employee will be able, with increasing experience, to assist in tying increases in freedom to increases in employability. They can help make sure that the continuum of vocational training is not arbitrarily fragmented by release into the community to take any job available, no matter how phony, rather than the job for which the offender was prepared.

Along with vocational rehabilitation counseling, there will also need to be continuing psychological support. For some offenders, the ability to cope with reality in acceptable fashion is about all that can be expected. For those of greater maturity and intellectual resources, continued participation in insight-producing group therapy seems desirable. Much more needs to be done to determine what combination of what services will most effectively bring about the reintegration into the community of the various types of offenders which can be differentiated in terms of service needs.

Deployment of Rehabilitation Counselors

In the light of the experience of the correctional field with the importation and naturalization of services from other fields, I believe that eventually there will emerge a rule that professional services to correctional clients must always be provided by the profession itself through its own natural agencies. Psychiatrists in the community, teachers in — or at least from — the community's own schools, or social workers from the community's social agencies should be the natural providers of professional services — not professionals who have abdicated their natural identifications and identities in favor of exclusive correctional practice. This position, which certainly has no special empirical support, is based on the principle that whatever we do to reduce the differentiation of the correctional client from the larger population will increase the probability of his reintegration. Service becomes more acceptable to the client himself; the various professional groups increase their understanding of the offender and his problems; and the question as to whether the client is getting first-class service is eliminated if he is receiving the same service as everybody else.

It seems highly desirable to me that vocational rehabilitation counselors should retain their identity in the rehabilitation services rather than becoming correctional in allegiance. Their caseloads should be differentiated no more than absolutely necessary. They should, however, be stationed where they can offer early service, where they can carry out case-finding, and where, above all, continuity of service can be most easily maintained. Certainly, they should be stationed in schools, where most correctional clients should probably be enrolled. There should be intimate liaison with probation agencies and with institutional superintendents. Wherever a correctional client is found to have a vocational problem, a vocational rehabilitation representative should have done the finding and should be working with the offender on the solution.

Community Services for the Offender

Until recently, the evolution of corrections has been glacial, partly because nobody cared much, partly because of the isolation of correctional services from the rest of the community. During the last decade or so, we seem to have discovered many new services which had to be added to the correctional armamentarium. The tendency was to incorporate these services as integral parts of the correctional system.

The time may have arrived to reverse this process, to call on the community to make its general people-serving and people-changing agencies available to the offender. What this will eventually do to the structure of the correctional system itself, I will not venture to predict. However, I am sure that in this direction we will learn how to restore the offender to the community more often by changing his career. I am also sure that we will learn how to do a far better preventive job by spreading correctional concern through the professional groups. A splendid point to begin this process is in the initiation of a coherent administration of vocational rehabilitation.

CURRENT VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION RESEARCH IN CORRECTIONAL SETTINGS

Nathan Ed Acree, Moderator

During the last several years the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has funded some 1,200 research projects. Of these, about 35 have been in correctional rehabilitation, what we call our offender projects.

The four men who will discuss current projects with you will briefly describe programs covering a range of activities. The first presentation deals with our Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program, in which the state rehabilitation agency works with offenders who are about to be released or have recently been released from federal correctional institutions. This program is designed to test the effectiveness of eight projects working simultaneously in different geographical areas but with common definitions and research design. This is a new approach for us, at least on this scale.

The Alcoholic Offender Project in Portland, Oregon is a program in which the state rehabilitation agency is working with a county and city to devise individualized treatment for one of our most common and least-helped types of offenders — the man who is repeatedly arrested for drinking offenses.

The plastic surgery program in New York City is the joint effort of the city's department of corrections, a mental health society, and a large hospital. The service is offered to selected men with facial disfigurements who have been sentenced to one of the country's largest jails. Most jails, as you know, do not attempt to do much, if anything at all, to rehabilitate prisoners. So this project may have significance, we feel, for correctional programming in the future.

Finally, there will be a discussion of a program to alleviate and prevent juvenile behavior problems in four schools of a large city: Tulsa, Okla. Here the school, the local juvenile court, and the state departments of vocational rehabilitation, welfare, and education are cooperating to work on a problem which is of great concern to the American public today.

These brief presentations will give you some insight into the kinds of research which VRA believes to be significant and which it is helping to fund at the present time.

Mr. Acree is executive secretary of the general research study section, division of research and demonstration, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration.

FEDERAL OFFENDERS REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Percy B. Bell and Merlyn Matthews

The Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program is designed for the conduct of collaborative research on the rehabilitation of federal offenders. The staff is responsible for the conduct of this research in eight projects. Its purposes are:

1. To measure the effectiveness of the use of a VR (vocational rehabilitation) counselor in the correctional process.
2. To test the relative effectiveness of the timing of the intervention of the services of the VR counselor.
3. To test the practicality of collaborative research as a method.

The seed of the Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program was planted by Mary E. Switzer, then Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, and James V. Bennett, then Director of the U. S. Bureau of Prisons, at Atlanta in 1963. Glenn C. Petty, of the Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts, was the chief gardener, who protected and nurtured the idea as it grew.

Many factors went into the selection of the vocational rehabilitation agency which was to undertake the study. The State of Washington was finally selected, and E. M. Oliver, the Director of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, provided the local support to get the project under way.

The first seven months of the Program — April 1-October 31, 1965 — were devoted to planning.[1] Agreements were confirmed for eight projects in Atlanta, Ga.; Chicago and Springfield, Ill.; Denver, Colo.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Raleigh, N. C.; San Antonio, Texas; and Seattle, Wash. The Raleigh project was replaced by a project in Tampa, Fla., because of North Carolina's inability to provide matching funds.

The operational phase of the Program began in November 1965 with a conference of personnel from the eight projects and four federal agencies: VRA, Bureau of Prisons, Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts, and the Board of Parole.

Objectives of the Program

VRA has supported a number of correctional rehabilitation research projects. Each was designed to measure some facet of the corrective process. These projects have produced and are producing valuable results. The intent of collaborative research is to have a number of projects working under the same design, so that the results from project to project could be statistically compared. I believe that we do have a design which will be very productive and should produce a good, solid base for recommendations to states regarding correctional rehabilitation.

In this collaborative research, the eight projects, working under one design, are geared to test and demonstrate the effects of providing intensive

---

Mr. Bell is director of the Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program, and Mrs. Matthews is research director.

[1] The final report of the planning grant period (under date of January 1966, 15 pp.), is available in limited quantities.

vocational rehabilitation services to offenders at different stages in the correctional process. Three of the projects start their service in the federal institutions. Five provide service at the time the clients are assigned to the U. S. Probation and Parole Office. Three projects provide service 60 to 90 days after assignment to the probation or parole office. Data collection and analysis are centralized in the Seattle project.

The clients for this Program are selected on a random basis and are divided into an intensive service group and two control groups.

The specific objectives of the Program are:

1. To determine the needs of federal offenders for vocational rehabilitation services according to their physical, mental, and social handicaps.
2. To provide intensive vocational rehabilitation services (in accordance with needs) to federal offenders who have been randomly assigned to demonstration groups.
3. To develop measures of success of "intensive" versus "current" services in the vocational rehabilitation of federal offenders.
4. To develop related studies and take advantage of research opportunities as they appear in the planning of data collection and in data analysis.
5. To study the impact of providing intensive rehabilitation services to offenders upon the attitudes and practices of the professional staff in various agencies involved in the correctional process.
6. To develop recommendations for changes in administrative procedures and public laws relating to correctional and rehabilitation fields.

Present Status of the Program

The Program was set up to have a seven-month planning study, a three-year period in which services were to be provided to clients and data collected, to be followed by a six-month period of analysis and report writing.

The first year of client services was extended four months to allow for a tooling-up period. We are now in the second grant period for client services. Thus we are now half-way through the Program.

Cases Assigned

Item	*February 28, 1967*	*June 1, 1967*
Intensive Service	496	530
Control No. 1	501	525
Control No. 2	638	868
TOTAL	1,635	1,923

At the end of the first grant period, the 496 intensive service cases were in statuses as follows:

Evaluation of planning	215
In-training or ready for employment	62
Suitably employed, but not yet declared rehabilitated	47
Adequate social adjustment (rehabilitated)	12
Delayed planning or interrupted status	108
Closed without contact and closed after service (not rehabilitated)	52

Statistical evaluation of closures cannot be provided at this time. However, from a review of cases that have been closed, we believe that we may expect about a third of our clients to be lost because we are unable to establish any working relationship. With a second third, we may expect to provide some service but be of no specific help in their re-establishment in society because the clients believe they have no need or are uncooperative. In about one-third of the cases, we may expect to provide material assistance in helping them to become productive and worthwhile members of society.

The tentative recidivism findings might remind you of Dr. Glaser's study of a prison population.[2] As you recall, his study did not include applying stimuli to the non-recidivating two-thirds. We believe our study will definitely show that this group will be further benefited by the contacts made and services provided.

Questions for Which Answers Are Sought

I have attempted to give you some idea of what we are aiming at and where we are at the present time. Now I would like to point out a few of the specific questions which we may or may not be able to answer at the end of our research.

1. To what extent are the procedures and services of the vocational rehabilitation agencies helpful in rehabilitating federal offenders?
2. At what point in the rehabilitation process is the intervention of the rehabilitation counselor the most effective?
3. To what extent will released federal offenders apply, independently or by referral, for appropriate services?
4. What methods are appropriate for motivating the federal offender to receive those services which help his re-establishment as a productive and worthy member of society?
5. What effect does the nature of the crime itself have on the prognosis for rehabilitation of federal offenders?
6. What changes in state plans may be necessary in order to be successful in rehabilitating federal offenders? How are these changes to be implemented?
7. What are the characteristics of clients that we term "successful"?
8. What are the characteristics of the clients that we are unable to contact?
9. What are the characteristics of the clients with whom we are unsuccessful after contact?
10. Is the collaborative research process a process that we would recommend for other research studies?
11. Are basic changes in the federal vocational rehabilitation law required to produce satisfactory results in working with federal offenders?
12. What personnel will be required to provide vocational rehabilitation services to probationers, parolees, and those still incarcerated in federal institutions?

---

[2] Daniel Glaser, *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964).

Some Tentative Impressions

Although no statistically valid conclusions can be drawn at this time, we do have some impressions that may be passed on. Please realize these are *tentative* impressions only. We feel that:

1. Recidivism will not be materially affected.
2. Contacts established by the VR counselors will be helpful even though the client interrupts or discontinues services or even returns to prison.
3. For those who are able to carry through to a socially adjusted status, the results of rehabilitation will be outstanding. There will be an increase in earning power resulting in an increased tax base. This, coupled with the reduced cost of supervision and incarceration, will demonstrate the economic value of providing rehabilitation services to federal offenders.
4. Our program can show the effectiveness of working closely with employers and trainers and thus result in a changed attitude toward ex-offenders.

Implementation

I would like now to say a little bit about the implementation of a program of this kind. Experience has shown that each of the states involved has some peculiarity of state administration of vocational rehabilitation and that some of these peculiarities may have to be changed in order to be effective in working with the particular clients.

The results so far give the impression that working with the family as a unit, rather than with just the client, is not only feasible but absolutely necessary in the rehabilitation of offenders. This may make it necessary to have guidelines from VRA itself which encourage this type of service. Implementation may be rather slow unless some dedicated person from each state pushes necessary action. Strong national leadership will also be required.

In closing, I wish to state that it has been a thrilling experience for me to direct this study. I have had outstanding cooperation and support from the four federal agencies, the five assistant commissioners of VRA, the nine chief U. S. probation officers, and the seven directors of vocational rehabilitation agencies of the states involved. We are looking forward to the completion of this study and believe that it will be a real contribution to correctional rehabilitation knowledge.

ALCOHOLIC OFFENDER REHABILITATION PROJECT

Milton K. Davis

Our project was set up to determine the effectiveness of the rehabilitation model in working with alcoholic offenders who are on probation. About two-thirds of the funds come from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and one-third jointly from the City of Portland and Multnomah County, Oregon.

Mr. Davis is research director for the project.

Basic Characteristics of the Program

Let me mention several important aspects of the program, both as to treatment and as to research.

1. One of the major efforts in this project is to demonstrate that a rehabilitation program for alcoholic offenders is most effective when tailored to the individual offender. Thus we have not designated any standardized treatment for all the clients, such as chemotherapy or group counseling. Instead, we try to determine carefully the type of treatment most likely to succeed with each man.

2. Unlike many other projects, which set up a certain period of sobriety or some other specific criterion, we did not begin by adopting any a priori definition of "improvement." Our goal is to develop behavioral data which can be used in establishing an index of effectiveness.

3. Nor did we define "alcoholic" in theoretical terms. We said only that our clients should be people who have had two arrests involving drinking offenses within the past year, or three arrests of record. Thus our definition is an operational one.

4. Since all our clients have been in difficulty with the law and are now on probation, there is an element of coercion in the program.

In addition to probation status and arrest record, our subjects must be 18 to 55 years of age. They must be residents of Multnomah County for other than temporary reasons.

Design of the Program

Our clientele is divided into an experimental group and a control group. We hope to end with about 100 subjects in each group.

As soon as the individual has been sentenced by the court and placed on probation, he is processed through the regular probation agency procedures and reports to the alcoholic offender project. We then begin the collection of baseline data.

A lengthy questionnaire is largely related to the DAWESH factors commonly used in work with alcoholics. In other words, we compile information about drinking behavior; arrest record; work history and occupational level; economic factors such as income and other resources; social history; and health information.

We also give each client four psychological tests. Two tests are used for diagnosis and two for research purposes.

Finally, all subjects are given a physical examination.

At this point, the subjects are randomly assigned to the experimental or to the control group. Since there are a number of different judges in the municipal court, a possible source of contamination in subject assignment could result. Not only would the personal biases and convictions of the different judges influence results, but also judges who handle traffic violations involving drinking, for example, deal with a different sub-population than those working with the regular "drunk" or "drunk on the street." To avoid this bias, the assignment of cases was carried out by first determining the sentencing judge and then assigning subjects alternatively to experimental and control groups. A log was maintained for each separate judge so that it was possible to know in which group any given subject should be placed. This procedure was routinized so that the characteristics of each individual subject did not enter into his assignment to the experimental or control group.

The control subjects receive no treatment. We contact them at the end of

six months and administer a shortened form of the questionnaire, to try to get some indications of what changes, if any, have taken place. At the end of one year, the control subjects are called back to give us all the items on which we gathered baseline data.

Treatment and Evaluation

The experimental subjects have initial interviews with a rehabilitation counselor and a project social worker. They are routinely sent for psychological evaluation by one of our consulting psychologists. If the evaluation suggests more intensive psychiatric assessment, this is provided. If the physical examination reveals that additional information is needed, it is collected.

All information is then reviewed in staffing sessions attended by the social worker, the vocational counselor, our medical consultant, a psychological consultant, and often other professionals who have something to contribute. A plan is developed, and the subject is assigned to a counselor who has responsibility for carrying out the plan.

We in the research division do not see subjects from the time when baseline data are collected until a six-month period has elapsed. At this time they, like the control group, are given an abbreviated questionnaire. At the end of 12 months, we again collect information on the whole range of baseline data.

Some Problems

At this point, we have contacted for the six-month evaluation 40 of the experimental subjects and 13 of the control subjects. As these figures suggest, we are having some difficulty in obtaining the cooperation of our control group. For the 12-month evaluation, we stand at 13 experimental and only 5 control subjects. So, of course, any information we have gathered is extremely tentative.

One research problem relates to the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. At three different times — baseline, six months later, and six months after that — we ask the subject a number of questions about his behavior during the previous six or 12 months. Thus, we have a basis for checking — two independent sets of information on the same behavior. From this we can run some reliability figures. Those I have run range from a low of .26 to a high of about .99.

One of the other areas we are constantly checking through comparing information given on questionnaires by the same individuals is the extent to which they answer honestly. If you have ever worked with alcoholics, you know that there is a great deal of inventiveness and creativity in this group, especially when it comes to answering questions.

PLASTIC SURGERY PROGRAM FOR REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS

Wallace Mandell

The program I am to describe is a cooperative venture between the New York City Department of Correction, Montefiore Hospital, and the Staten Island Mental Health Society. It is an attempt to determine the rehabilitative

---

Mr. Mandell, who is the principal investigator in this program, is director of the Wakoff Research Center in Staten Island, N.Y.

effects of plastic surgery for the removal of facial and somatic disfigurements of selected prisoners in New York City jails.

The Jail as a Setting for Research

To give you better understanding of the problems of doing research in jails, particularly in a complicated area like the provision of plastic surgery, let me give a bit of general background information which is already known to some of you.

In 1964 the National Jail Association estimated that there were over 3,000 county jails, 10,000 city jails and lockups, and 100 workhouses in the United States. These institutions range in size from those which handle one or two people to the jail in New York City which handles over 10,000 individuals in a day.

A total of two million people pass through the country's jails during the year, of whom over half are sentenced prisoners. The majority of these offenders are repeaters with histories of social deviance as well as growing records of crime. Jails are frequently described as short-term institutions. However, over half of them house offenders with sentences of more than 30 days, sometimes as long as three years.

The cost of operating jails is at best an estimate, since no one has all the figures. Informed estimates, however, place the total operating costs at over $150 million per year. The per capita cost is believed to be over $1,000 per year per prisoner, and this averages out to $2.87 per day. In New York City, however, the operating cost is running closer to $12 per prisoner per day.

In recent years, the number of prisoners in many jurisdictions has increased much faster than the space available to handle them. In New York City, for example, the average daily sentenced population increased by 53 percent between 1954 and 1965 — from 6,700 to 10,000 per day — while space increased by 18 percent.

In New York City, more than 60 percent of our prisoners are addicts. They are worse educated than the general population; a ninth-grade education is the mode. Unequipped to compete in the job market, they have sporadic employment; life is a series of short-term, unskilled, low-paying jobs interspersed with periods of unemployment. While the percentage of addiction may be higher in New York than in smaller jurisdictions, the other characteristics are probably common to most jail populations.

In 1964, when our program was undertaken, the average length of stay in jail for definite-sentence prisoners was 6.4 months; for indefinite-sentence prisoners, 12.2 months; and for reformatory prisoners, 9.9 months.

In the light of all these facts, it is easy to see why corrections has never really believed that the jail can be a rehabilitative institution. Prisoners are not there very long, facilities are crowded, and there is not much money to work with. Hence there has been a prime commitment to custody in order to protect the community.

This is mirrored on the professional side with lack of professional participation in the programming and services of institutions that are low on funds. It is hard to attract professionals because of the low status of these jobs in the professional community. One of the most important issues is whether there will ever be an opportunity ladder within correctional systems for professional personnel. Even if you can attract an individual to a low beginning pay base, there is seldom any place for him to move to except that of assistant to the warden. Since it is only from the warden's job that you can

influence administrative policy and programming, there is no reason for a professional to enter the system in the first place, no matter how much you may increase salary incentives.

Basic Orientation of the Program

Jails are estranged from the health, education, and welfare agencies of the community which are responsible for providing services to the same families which the jail serves. The jail obviously deals with the most undesirable clientele who are, in many senses, the failures of every other agency. Secondly, the jail cannot reciprocate services. It cannot relieve the welfare department by saying, "We will take some of your clients if you will take some of ours," which is a common form of working agreement between agencies. Reciprocity is impossible because the jail does not control entry to, and in many places exit from, its services. It is itself a captive institution.

Since it is essential to have inter-agency cooperation in a rehabilitation program, we looked for some alternative pattern for securing services to rehabilitate prisoners. We decided to use a health service as the focus for developing a program.

Specifically, we set out to answer the question: Can a program of rehabilitation services be developed around cosmetic surgery for offenders?

This is an attractive subject for publicity purposes. It has a perpetual fascination for the public, and we are committed to looking for projects which could win allegiance and develop the image of jails as being involved in exciting programs.

It is also attractive to correctional personnel because of the many theories about the influence of physical appearance on social deviance, which need not be reviewed here. One of them deals with the way in which the stigmata of lower-class membership and the esthetic problems of minority groups limit the vocational and social alternatives of their members. Our basic orientation is to see whether plastic surgery or other health services can make available to an offender alternative roles in society, whether such a program can increase the options open to individuals who are stigmatized as members of deviant groups.

We were fortunate in interesting Dr. Michael Lewin, who is an internationally known plastic surgeon on the staff of the Montefiore Hospital in New York City. He had previously developed experience in working with offenders at Sing Sing and was able to provide a staff of high-quality surgeons. The hospital is interested in research in medicine. Its stake is not research in corrections.

The Staten Island Mental Health Society, which I represent, is involved in service programs and in studies in mental and social deviance. Its stake is an interest in research on the problems of transition between social roles and between institutions. As an agency, it is frequently involved in inter-agency negotiations.

The Department of Correction was eager to have service, along with research, provided by professionals. It felt that, at this point in its history, such service could be obtained only outside its own structure.

Problems in the Program

We started off with the hypothesis that a program of surgical and social rehabilitation of offenders would benefit vocational adjustment and cut down on recidivism.

We had many problems in inserting this project into the various agencies. Corrections faced the lack of manpower and the difficulty of changing the routines of a large institution.

The hospital had no experience at all in dealing with an offender population, even though it had run clinics for lower-class people throughout its long history. Our patients were going to be screened in the prison, which would leave the hospital with few controls over them.

Then there were problems with both medical and social implications. For example, most plastic surgery involves addicting the patient to some extent. How then do you do surgery on someone who is an addict or an ex-addict?

Furthermore, a large proportion of the offender population is made up of pigmented individuals. However, plastic surgery is not so effective with them as with fair-skinned people.

One of the great problems in offender populations is tattoos and needle tracks. No one has developed good surgical techniques for dealing with this problem.

I discovered that, no matter how experienced the directors were, I could not recruit experienced research staff for this kind of project. Those I did engage were making all kinds of fumbles in asking for information from people who were unaccustomed to supplying it and found the questions a source of concern, if not resentment.

Further, we did not have resources in New York City to deal, even in a small project, with the additional caseload we were going to present to community agencies — 200 additional difficult cases. The agencies began to balk at taking these cases, and we had to work out all kinds of arrangements — through inter-agency negotiations, personal appeals, and other ways we had not anticipated — to get services for our clients.

Finally, the agencies were not used to working with each other in this way. After the great crisis of three project directors succeeding each other in four months, VRA helped us by insisting that very senior people in the agencies meet. Then we began to get cooperation.

Design of the Research

It does not make sense to start any program which does not include scientific evaluation. Indeed, we attempted to adhere as closely as possible to the classic model of research.

We informed the prisoners of the availability of the service. They volunteered by filling out call slips. Screening by plastic surgeons eliminated a great many.

The rate of deformity in the population was 8 percent, including facial disfigurements of developmental and traumatic nature, tattoos, and needle tracks. This is very high in comparison to the general population.

The Montefiore surgeons believed that in only about 40 percent of the cases could they do any good. Another 25 percent were eliminated through psychological screening because they had concomitant kinds of psychological deviation which would make them high risks for breakdown after surgery.

After all of this screening, we began to assign individuals randomly to the various treatment groups.

After release from jail 25 percent of those who were randomly assigned refused to go into the hospital for surgery. This gives you the problem of a self-selected experimental group, which is the bane of everybody's existence in research in this area. Could we have forced everybody into the hospital and then rejected them? Could we have insisted on surgery for people who didn't want it? Both approaches are untenable, for different reasons, at the present time.

We ended up with 193 subjects distributed into four groups. The Lord and statistics willing — I don't know why — it turns out that there are no background differences between the groups in the four experimental situations.

We have had 80 good surgeries. With this population there are all sorts of problems. Even after you deliver surgery, they won't take care of themselves; so they infect the wounds. Because they don't understand physicians' instructions — such as "change the bandage," which does not mean re-wrapping with the same bandage — we have to institute steps to explain the instructions.

Tentative Conclusions

Through monumental effort, we now have complete and corroborated follow-up on 168 subjects. (We finally had to pay people to locate some of the subjects because they didn't want to take time off from work to spend several hours with us for which we paid them.) In the control group the follow-up rate is almost as good as for the experimental groups, which was about 80 percent.

Lo and behold, recidivism in the surgery group is 49 percent during the one-year follow-up. In the non-surgery group it is 66 percent. The difference is statistically significant.

There are problems of interpretation. We have included some kinds of controls which I haven't described here.

But at this juncture I am willing to say that, as best this study could be done under the circumstances, at the present time plastic surgery does reduce the recidivism rate as we have measured it. We have personally tracked down everybody into the jail, using all the eye reports and the state follow-up services.

The aftermath of this study is yet to be seen, because we have discovered that it requires a large volume of service to get the subjects into surgery once they have left jail. It requires an even larger volume of services to paper-shuffle the man into the agencies that can deliver the social and vocational services which are such a vital part of the program.

And frankly I have to ask myself this question: If research were not involved, if the researchers didn't have their necks at stake to produce a report, would the agencies have expended the energy they did on this kind of program?

We have yet to do a cost/benefit analysis. We have set the pattern now on at least one other study in this area. Everybody has to sit down and figure out the cost of this kind of service — how many thousands of dollars for medical service, transfer service, and all the rest. It might have been cheaper to keep the guy in jail, even at $12 a day.

But at least in one other study that was released just yesterday, there was positive cost/benefit. So we think we may end up that way.

A COOPERATIVE PROGRAM FOR ALLEVIATION OF JUVENILE BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS

Glen K. Wallace

The purpose of this program is to reduce and/or prevent delinquency by providing individualized education and vocational training in conjunction with intensive counseling and close supervision for youngsters with behavior problems. The cooperating agencies are the Tulsa public schools, the Tulsa juvenile court, the state department of vocational rehabilitation, the state department of public welfare, and the state department of education, under whose auspices the program is administered.

The program serves youngsters in Roosevelt and Carver Junior High Schools and in Central and Washington High Schools in Tulsa. All of these schools serve attendance areas with a particularly high incidence rate of delinquency. Students selected for the program were identified by the juvenile court or welfare agency as having one or more of the following characteristics:

1. Manifesting delinquent or pre-delinquent behavior as evidenced by prior court referrals;
2. Being neglected by parents or guardians as revealed by records of the department of public welfare; and/or
3. Having been committed to either a state training school or a home for neglected children.

Students were identified by school officials as:

1. Displaying either extreme behavioral or emotional problems;
2. Establishing a poor school attendance pattern; and/or
3. Achieving at a substandard educational level in relation to intellectual level.

Methodology

During the 1965-66 school year, the Juvenile Behavior Program was operated as a demonstration project involving students in grades seven through twelve. Matched groups of students believed to exhibit a similar degree of delinquent behavior were selected for the study. Those designated as the experimental group were enrolled in supervised study, described below, and received the coordinated attention of project counselors from the public schools, the juvenile court, the rehabilitation department, and the department of public welfare. Those assigned to the control group continued in the regular school curriculum and received no special assistance other than that provided under the normal procedures of each of the four cooperating agencies.

To all students in the experimental group a battery of tests was administered, including achievement and aptitude tests and interest inventories. Test results enabled both counselors and teachers to counsel the student in a more meaningful selection of courses and of vocational exploration. This was particularly important because of the wide range in educational achievement, native ability, grade placement, and chronological age.

Mr. Wallace is director of the program.

Supervised Study

The curriculum of students in the experimental group was not basically changed. For the most part, they took classes in the regular instructional program of the school. They were, however, assigned to a supervised study course as they would normally be enrolled in an elective course, and they received credit for it.

A minimum of 10 and a maximum of 15 students were enrolled in a supervised study course. Three teachers and the agency counselors were involved in teaching, guidance, and counseling in supervised study. Thus they were able to provide individualized instruction and counseling for all students in the group and to see that working students had meaningful and appropriate job placements and supervision. They also made the home and community contacts necessary to implement the program. They kept records on personal progress, job evaluations, and observations of students' behavior in the community.

Each teacher assigned to the program had four class periods a day, approximately 60 students in all. The remainder of the teacher's day was set aside for job placement and supervision, individual counseling, and work with his teaching and counseling colleagues in the program. The teacher also worked with all of his students' other teachers in the regular school program, to develop better understanding of each youngster's individual abilities and needs.

Evaluation

Two types of data were gathered in an attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in alleviating delinquent behavior, as evidenced by differences between the experimental and the control groups.

1. *Achievement data* to measure differences in academic achievement. The groups were equated on initial differences as measured by the seventh grade Otis I.Q. scores and by the students' grade point averages during the 1964-65 school year. The criterion measures of achievement were the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Advanced Battery, Form BM, on Reading, Spelling, and Arithmetic Computation, which were administered in May 1966. The effects of I.Q. and grade point average were held constant through analysis of covariance, while the significance of the observed differences in achievement on each of the three subtests was tested. None of the differences between the two groups were found to be significant.
2. *Performance data* related to the behavior and attitudes of the students. It was believed that measurement of the following factors would reveal any significant changes in the tendency toward delinquent behavior among these students: (1) the number of half days present; (2) grade point average; (3) number of school offenses; (4) attitude rating; and (5) number of court referrals. For each of these five factors, comparable information was gathered for the previous school year (1964-65) and at the close of the first year of the project (1965-66). These factors for the preceding school year were held constant through analysis of covariance, while the significance of observed differences for the current year were tested sep-

arately for each of the five variables. Adjusted means for the two groups were:

Variable	*Experimental*	*Control*	*F ratio*
Half Days Present	315.953	315.761	.003
Grade Point Average	20.407	16.591	20.704*
School Offenses	4.468	4.082	.207
Attitude Rating	6.381	4.958	11.332*
Court Referrals	.214	.120	1.754

* Significant at .01 level of confidence.

Project personnel observed early in the year that the experimental students were a more delinquent group than were the control group pupils, a condition which constitutes a bias of indeterminate magnitude in the first year's study. In retrospect, it is believed that this assignment of students with more serious behavior problems to the experimental program was a result of the commendable but unfortunate desire of school personnel to help those students most needing the services. It is believed that through better assignment procedures the groups for the second year are more nearly equated on the degree of initial delinquency.

The "performance data" used to evaluate behavioral changes, while considered valid measures, should be supplemented with other instruments. If appropriate standardized instruments with established norms cannot be found, perhaps such measuring devices can be created expressly for this study.

The principal problem encountered with "achievement data" was the difficulty of securing complete test scores on all pupils. It is recommended that make-up tests be given as soon as possible to all experimental and control pupils so that complete baseline information will be available, even on those who drop out during the year.

Tentative Conclusions from the Study

The following table shows the median scores on the measures of deviant behavior during 1965-66 and 1966-67. Bearing in mind the limitations of the project and the data discussed above, inspection suggests that the experimental group made greater improvement in school attendance and in school behavior.

Variable	*Experimental Group* (N=121)	*Control Group* (N=132)
Half Days Present		
Previous Year (1965-1966)..	321.3	332.5
Current Year (1966-1967)....	324.3	331.8
	3.0 Increase	.7 Decrease
Grade Point Average		
Previous Year	1.57	1.86
Current Year	1.46	1.78
	.11 Decrease	.08 Decrease
School Offenses		
Previous Year	2.8	1.2
Current Year	1.4	1.5
	1.4 Decrease	.3 Decrease

Variable	*Experimental Group* (N=121)	*Control Group* (N=132)
Attitude Rating		
Previous Year	6.4	5.6
Current Year	5.6	5.3
	.8 Decrease	.3 Decrease
Court Referrals		
Previous Year	.1	.1
Current Year	.1	.0
	0.0	.1 Decrease

It can be said that, while these findings do not constitute incontrovertible evidence of the efficacy of this approach, they do offer promise that the program can assist delinquent and pre-delinquent secondary students to modify their anti-social behavior.

The Team Approach to Services

Perhaps as significant for the future as *what* is being done in our program is *how* it is being done. Activities are based on the team concept. The coordinating team provides the integration of the services of the cooperating agencies, and an educational team provides an individualized program of educational services.

The coordinating team, whose members come from the four participating agencies, have three main areas of responsibility. First, they function as liaison between the agencies from which they have been assigned and the other members of the program. Second, when a youngster's case is referred, it is the responsibility of the coordinating team to acquire all the information required to evaluate his needs. The third responsibility is to supply guidance and counseling for the youngsters.

The work of the education team has been described above. In the coming year, more intensive and sophisticated group counseling will be used in the supervised study courses, under co-leaders, one of whom will be a teacher and the other an agency counselor.

As government is increasingly involved in services, there is a need for some form of coordination of *all* agencies in the community. Efforts to this end in Tulsa and elsewhere have previously met with only limited success. Project personnel are striving for more than mere exchange of information. Our objective is real cooperation at all levels, not merely direction from the top to provide a measure of guidance. This project has proposed to spell out the task of coordination through its "team" effort.

We feel that our program therefore has implications considerably beyond the provision of services to a given group at a particular time. It has revealed the need for greater flexibility among participating agencies. Areas of poor communication within each agency have also been spotlighted. In most instances there is understanding and excellent communication at the top (among administrators and directors) and at the bottom (counselors and teachers). The "middle men" (the immediate supervisors of the counselors of the different agencies) need to have better understanding if they are not to be stumbling blocks in a cooperative program. Counselors also need special training to make them knowledgeable about the work of all community agencies concerned with behavior problems, including the character-building organizations.

CURRENT INFORMATION BASES FOR EVALUATING CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS

Don M. Gottfredson

My task is to describe the current situation with respect to information bases for evaluating correctional rehabilitation programs. In my view, the situation can be described very briefly — it's deplorable.

There are, of course, to use John Conrad's phrase, some notable and honorable exceptions. But, by and large around the country, there aren't any information systems that really are very useful in helping correctional administrators to evaluate what they are doing.

Shortcomings of Information Bases

I realize that "deplorable" is a harsh term, but I believe it can be justified. Suppose you are a correctional administrator and you must make a program decision on training. You need to know, for example, how many of your people have been in an academic training program for at least a year or how many have gone through your sheet metal training program. Or perhaps you're evaluating counseling. Suppose you need to know how many of your people have been in group counseling at least a year and how many have been in the program for three years or more. Suppose you wish to know something about the achievements of these offenders after release. But you can't get even these simple kinds of information without having a special study made. This is the situation even where we have the most advanced beginnings of information systems.

I don't mean to deprecate these beginnings. Tremendously good starts have been made in California, in Washington, in Wisconsin, in Minnesota, and in New York, to name a few. A lot of hard work has gone into them, work that I do not wish to downgrade.

However, the people involved in these efforts might agree with me that their systems have many shortcomings in terms of the breadth or scope of information that is available within their systems and in terms of ability to provide quickly the kinds of information needed for decision-making.

A related problem is the lack of uniformity over these systems which we discussed briefly this morning. When we have trouble (as we did) defining such a term as "recidivism," it is immediately clear that we don't all mean the same thing by the word. We can operationally define the term for the specific purpose of a single research project; and it then means just what we wish it to mean for that study. But it may not mean the same thing for someone else in the same system or in another jurisdiction. Thus it appears to many people that, in order to share information effectively, we need to develop some uniformity of definitions.

It is a deplorable situation, too, when the Crime Commission appointed by the President of the United States has to contract with a private agency — the National Council on Crime and Delinquency — to try to find out how many people are locked up in this country's jails, prisons, and training schools.

Mr. Gottfredson is director of the research center of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency at Davis, California.

When you consider the large sums spent for such institutions and the tremendous responsibilities that administrators have for their programs, you really would think that information at least on the scope of the enterprise would be easily available. But it is not.

The situation is all the more deplorable because we do collect a good deal of information in corrections. Recently I was in the basement of the California Medical Facility at Vacaville, where they keep the older archives of the prison system of the state. I was looking through records dating back to about 1890. A particularly interesting set of records had been kept by the hangman. He described all the hangings, giving information on the age, height, and weight of the prisoner, the length of the drop, and such matters. And he had carefully rated each hanging as "very successful" or "successful." (I found no unsuccessful hangings.) Search as I might, I found no evidence that this collection of information ever served any useful purpose.

If you go through almost any prison system, you find that a good deal of information is collected, much of it in fairly systematic form. Then it is put into individual case files. Thus the administrator can find out whether a given *individual* has or has not been in school or in group counseling or whatnot, and for how long. This information is useful for decisions concerning that particular individual, but it is not useful at all for broad institutional decisions that the administrator must make about programs.

The Kinds of Information Needed

In order to address the general question of the kind of information base we need, it seems useful to think for the moment about the nature of a decision — say, a program decision — that the administrator must make. It can be argued that any decision has essentially three components. First, the administrator has some objective at the time the decision is to be made. Second, he has to have information to use in arriving at his decision. And third, there is hopefully some relationship between the information he has to work with and the goal he wishes to achieve.

We spend a lot of money and effort in collecting information, and certainly we spend a lot of effort and money in making decisions. But we spend very little of either in studying any relationship between the information we have to work with and the goals we would like to attain.

The situation is complex, however, as our discussion this morning suggested, because there are so many things we wish to study. In California a few years ago a cultural anthropologist visited the men's institution at Chino. He spent several months observing the natives and studying the strange customs in that savage land. One of the things that impressed him most was the large number of treaters or medicine men in the institution. He talked about psychological healers and psychiatric healers, vocational healers, religious healers, recreational healers, quite a long list, really, of different treaters. We have the problem of evaluating each one of these programs. We have the additional problem of determining which treatments are appropriate for which classifications of persons.

One consequence of this complexity is that experimental designs for study of special projects, such as those we have been discussing, which represent the most rigorous approach to evaluation, are inadequate to the task of evaluating a large number of programs within a system. It's not administratively feasible to set up an experimental design for evaluation of each one of these programs.

Another model is needed, one that will give the administrator some information that will be helpful to him in making institutional decisions about the variety of programs which are his concern.

An Illustration

I would like to describe for you a very simple study that was done in industry. Given the complexity of corrections that we have begun to talk about, the study sounds simple indeed. But it gives a kind of paradigm that might help us to see another possible strategy for evaluation of correctional progress.

The study, which was described in the *Harvard Business Review*,[1] was done in a metal working concern where a polishing operation followed plating. The type of parts is unspecified in the account, but let's call them hubcaps.

For a number of years the management of this business had been troubled by the quality of the product. In the final inspection, about 10 percent of the hubcaps were rejected as imperfect.

There was no evidence as to what caused this 10 percent rejection rate. The management was convinced that it had to do with the polishing equipment used, with the polishing cloths used by polishers after the plating, or with the polishers themselves.

The engineer studying this problem first used an experimental design. It was fairly easy to have parts randomly assigned to the polishers and to have them use one polishing wheel.

The result showed that the administrators were wrong; the null hypothesis was supported. The 10 percent difference had nothing to do with the polishers or the polishing cloths.

The engineer then tried a different approach. He looked at the whole system in order to try to track down the source of the variation in the end product.

Looking at the variation in the end product and then analyzing this variance in terms of other components within the system can give us clues to the origin of the differences in the end product. This method is the fundamental approach to making inferences in statistics. Almost all the significance tests that were mentioned this morning stem from this general concept of analyzing the variations in some outcome.

The engineer then looked at the hubcaps going through the system over time. This is one component and possible source of variation; perhaps the variation in the end product might be attributable in part to differences over time.

Since there were 14 tanks (let's say) in which the plating process was completed, he had also a possible source of variation *between* tanks. A certain tank, or set of tanks, might be faulty.

There also might be some variation in end products associated with variation *within* individual tanks.

It is easy enough in this situation to break down the end-product variation into these three possible sources of variation, and to apply an appropriate significance test.

He found no differences over time. He found no significant differences between tanks. But he found a large and significant difference *within* tanks.

---

[1] Dorian Shainan, "The Statistically Designed Experiment," *Harvard Business Review*, XXXV (1957), 67-72.

Something within the tanks was the culprit, but no one had any idea what this might be. So they did the only thing they could think of; they walked out and looked at the tanks.

The only asymmetrical feature of the tanks was a hand valve on the right side. The valve was on a pipe which let steam into the tank in order to heat the solution which was necessary in this plating process. The pipes went down the right side, across the bottom, and up the left side. Hence, the steam was hotter on entering the tank and cooler on the other side. This set up a counter-clockwise motion in the solution, so that plating particles were rising on one side and falling on the other. Therefore, the objects being plated were getting different coatings, according to their positions within the tank. The solution to the problem was to relocate the heating coils.

Implications for Corrections

One point of this story for us is that the trouble was located only when the whole system was studied and an attempt was made to analyze the difference in outcomes in terms of the possible sources of variation throughout the system. It is easy to think of analogies for a prison system.

There is an end product. We have been debating this morning how to measure that end product. One way, certainly, is in terms of some definition of recidivism.

The point was well made, however, that there are other criteria of success of correctional programs. We know very little about how these criteria are related one to another, and we should begin finding out. In order to do this, what is needed is a system within any agency that will systematically keep track of reliable information about the *persons* in programs, about the *programs,* and about the various *outcomes* of interest.

We cannot look only at the end product, since we have people, not hubcaps, to deal with. We should stress the point made by Mr. Conrad this morning that we have to begin differentiating better the kinds of persons we have coming into the system. Nearly all studies in this field which failed to differentiate within the offender groups studied have supported the null hypothesis, supporting the view that there is no treatment effect. There are, however, a number of studies wherein appropriate classifications of offenders have been made and interactions then have been found between some kinds of persons and some kinds of treatment with respect to treatment outcomes.

Even if the offenders are classified in some meaningful way, there remains the problem of complexities of programs. We are very hard put at present even to find out who is in a given program, let alone very much information about the program and what happened. In order to study programs effectively we will need also systems for monitoring the programs. Whether or not the study demonstrates any treatment effects, we still should be in a position to describe the program.

In summary, we need much more information about offenders and ways of classifying them. We need classifications of kinds of programs, as well. (Even within one variety of program we quickly are confronted with considerable complexity. What kind of "group counseling" are we discussing. what is its duration, what are the qualifications of the counselors, and what particular techniques are used?) Concerning correctional goals, we need much more careful work together to define objectives. We must specify them in such a way that we can measure them, then ultimately analyze the variance

in "end products," relating this variation to classifications of persons and to different kinds of programs.

Uniform Parole Reporting System

I should like to describe one start toward such an information system, a small start but a promising one. This is the Uniform Parole Reporting System of the National Parole Institutes. I cite this program not only for what it attempts to do but for the opportunities it has given for a large number of people to participate and for the commitment it has stimulated in them.

The program came about from discussions about recidivism rates, or rates of parole violations. These discussions were a part of the National Parole Institutes, a series of seminars for parole board members. A basic purpose of the Institutes is to facilitate the sharing of information among the various parole jurisdictions participating in the program.

One topic invariably discussed is the meaning of recidivism. Participants have come to believe that it is necessary to agree on definitions and to begin collecting comparable information, if we are to share information effectively in the future.

In 1964, therefore, a meeting was held in Chicago to which each adult parole agency in the Nation was invited to send representatives. Twenty-eight parole systems were represented by about 40 top-level administrators. In this meeting, a tentative basic model for a uniform parole reporting system was worked out by the participants.

This is a very simple information system. It includes a definition of parole violation. It includes information on new offenses for which parolees have been convicted. A little information is included about the parolees involved, such as age, offense, prior record, and use of drugs or alcohol. From the data provided, the length of time served in prison before parole can be calculated. The system was made simple quite deliberately; this was considered necessary to allow the hope of getting information consistently and on schedule from a large number of parole systems.

During the year following the meeting, a pilot study was completed. Eight parole systems around the country collected this information every month and sent it to the National Parole Institutes. In addition, 16 agencies examined the definitions and other elements of the program and gave NPI feedback for revision. The purpose was to see whether the program was feasible. The result was the conclusion that the program is feasible and should be continued.

If it did nothing else, this program demonstrated that parole administrators can work togther, that they can collect uniform information on a regular schedule and send it to a central source. This may not sound like much now, but it had been a matter of heated debate for some time.

The program also demonstrated that there are differences in parole violation rates among various parole systems even when a common definition is used. It also showed, however, that differences in rates tell nothing about the relative effectiveness of parole systems, because there are marked differences in the kinds of persons paroled by the various systems. This being the case, the most one can hope to do will be to use statistical controls (such as those provided by an analysis of covariance) in order to have the best possible correction for the observed relevant differences.

After the feasibility study, a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health was received in order to permit continuation and further development of the uniform reporting program. A second national meeting was held to

review the system. A number of agencies have been added as participants. About 32 parole systems in the United States are now contributing data to this one central reporting source.

The project demonstrates not only that is it possible to make some beginnings toward collecting information in a uniform way; it shows also that it is possible to obtain the necessary collaboration from the administrators concerned.

The Uniform Parole Reporting System doesn't belong to any individual. It is very clear to the nation's parole board members and parole administrators who have participated that it belongs to them. They are the ones who developed it, and they should play a large role in defining what kinds of information should come back to them from the system.

The Uniform Parole Reporting System is a beginning that ultimately can provide the kind of information base which may be useful for program evaluations. Certainly some additional information can be added about institutional programs, so that the system can contain not only information about parole outcomes, but also some information about what happened to the parolee when he was in prison.

The system could be expanded also into areas of probation and of youth institutions. There would be much value in trying to do this with comparability of definitions in order to combine information from these different sectors of the administration of criminal justice.

Even if this were not done, there is now at least a beginning of an information system in a number of jurisdictions where no such statistical base supportive of research existed before. In a parole system where there has been very little systematic record-keeping, it is now possible, with very little additional expense, to study some special program of interest to the parole board or the parole administration. If, for example, the parole administrator initiates a specialized program for alcoholic offenders, he has a greater opportunity now to study it. If he now merely keeps track of who is in the program and how long, he can tie this program information in with the more general basic parole reporting system.

Information Systems and the Goals of Corrections

Myrl Alexander referred this morning to the history of correctional agencies. It must be said that at best we have been inefficient, at worst we have been inhumane, and at all times we have been confused. We need to lessen the confusion by being more specific about our objectives and agreeing upon them. If we then can build some information bases that will provide a start toward evaluation of programs in terms of these objectives, we can only become more efficient. If we then can identify specific kinds of treatments which are helpful to certain kinds of offenders, with respect to specified outcomes, our programs can be made more effective, more helpful to offenders and to the general public, and hence more humane.

ETHICAL AND LEGAL ISSUES IN EXPERIMENTATION WITH OFFENDER POPULATIONS

Gilbert Geis

The problems involved in research with and upon human beings are ironic, vicious, and often intensely paradoxical. The subject itself is pervaded with a good deal of piety and self-righteousness, and with two sets of antipodal values, neither of them inherently superordinate, which clash fiercely at times. Adherents who press for experimentation in the face of hesitation by others are apt to proclaim proudly that they are "scientists" and that their antagonists are "anti-intellectual" and "fuzzy intuitionists." Their opponents often find the experimenters lacking in compassion and human feeling, without sound comprehension of the legal elements basic to a democratic society. They believe that the experimenters sometimes use the scientific ethos as a camouflage for the infliction of gross indignity and deprivation upon helpless and uninformed people.

The irony lies, of course, in the exigencies of everyday existence, in which all sorts of injustice prevail as the consequence not of scientific experimentation but of happenstance. For most of us, it would be unthinkable that a sample of armed robbers be divided into two groups on the basis of random assignment — one group to spend 10 years in prison, the second to receive a sentence of 2 years on probation. Nonetheless, at a recent federal judicial conference, after examining an elaborate presentence report concerning a bank robber, 17 judges said they would have imprisoned the man, while 10 indicated they favored probation. Those voting for imprisonment set sentences ranging from 6 months to 15 years.[1] From the offender's viewpoint, the vagaries of random assignment for experimental purposes might seem preferable to the lottery of exposure to the considered judgment of a member of the judiciary.

Competing Values

The difficulty involved in attempts to gain consensus on working principles for correctional experimentation with offender populations stems in part from the fact that both major competing values have almost total support. Few persons are opposed to verified, accurate information; and few persons are opposed to the idea of human decency and justice. The dispute centers about the point at which one value is to be given priority, and it is also involved in judgments regarding the true character of the experimental intervention, the statistical likelihood of different outcomes, and the general importance of the findings, measured in terms of their cost.

The dilemma of correctional research, therefore, arises with great intensity not in the extreme cases but in those where both sides of the value equation are almost equally matched. Few persons, for instance, would be apt to say that the cause of science is sufficient to support an experiment in which, without exception, persons convicted of first-degree murder during a given year

---

Mr. Geis is professor of sociology at California State College, Los Angeles.

[1] "Test Presentence and Summary of Ballot," 27 Federal Rules Decisions 383 (1961).

are executed in order to determine whether capital punishment does in fact have a deterrent impact when categorically applied. Probably just as few persons would maintain that it is unjust to allow a convicted offender to choose between probation in the jurisdiction where he committed his offense and probation in one a thousand miles away, because an investigator wants to determine whether there is a deterrent factor in voluntary removal from the eliciting scene of criminal circumstances.

A Hypothetical Illustration

But how do we judge a situation [2] in which a foundation grant permits attorneys to be supplied for all cases being heard by a juvenile court where attorneys have previously appeared only in rare instances? A fundamental study hypothesis may be that the presence of an attorney tends to result in a more favorable disposition for the client. This idea may be tested by comparing dispositions prior to the beginning of the experiment with those ensuing subsequently, though it would be more satisfactory to supply attorneys to a sample of the cases and withhold them from the remainder, in order to calculate in a more experimentally uncontaminated manner the differences between the outcomes in the two situations.

The matter takes on additional complexity if the researchers desire to determine what particular attorney role is the most efficacious in the juvenile court. They may suspect that an attorney who acts as a friend of the court, knowingly taking its viewpoint as *parens patriae* and attempting to interpret the court's interests to his client, will produce more desirable results than one who doggedly challenges the courtroom procedure and the judge's interpretation of fact, picks at the probation report, raises constant objections, and fights for his client as he would in a criminal court. But what results are "more desirable"? Perhaps the argumentative approach will win dispositions more in the client's immediate interest, but the cooperative approach might in the long run better serve society and the client too by decreasing recidivism and by contributing to such measurable items as employment and earnings, marital stability, and general social adjustment.

Persons favoring the experimental use of divergent attorney roles — such roles can readily be inculcated in the attorneys by standard training techniques — might stress that, without the project and its foundation funds, no juvenile would be apt to have an attorney and thus any kind of representation is an improvement over normal conditions. They might also insist that the attorneys' views of their clients' best interest represent little more than a combination of myth and supposition, particularly in so uncharted an area as that of the juvenile court. In the long run, they could argue, all juveniles stand to benefit from this empirical determination of the consequences of diverse attorneys' roles.

Opponents of the experimental program, relying first on what they regard as an immutable professional obligation of the attorney, would be apt to suggest that it is unconscionable to deprive a single person of the effort that an attorney regards as his best in the interest of an experimental design. Failure to appeal a case to a higher court when the attorney suspects that an appeal is in order but the research blueprint does not call for intensive pursuit of technical legal points in stipulated cases, may result in commitment of a juvenile

[2] This hypothetical situation owes its genesis to discussions of the advisory committee for a study conducted by the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, when that committee met in Washington, D.C. in 1966.

who otherwise would have been set free. That the deprivation of liberty may be in the juvenile's best interests, the opponents of the experiment would probably say, is the kind of pious cant that underlay the Inquisition and that provides paving for that well-traveled historical highway to perdition.

The dialogue could be carried farther to convey the subtle nature of the issues involved in the manipulation of a situation suffused with ethical and legal considerations, in order to obtain empirical data. It might be suggested, for instance, that the appeal of a case would result in the freedom of a given juvenile but such a tactic could so antagonize the judge that he would handle all subsequent cases with greater harshness. Perhaps this view could be countered with one suggesting that to soar far beyond the given situation moves the debate into realms so remote that they are beyond speculative redemption. Perhaps it might be said that each juvenile must be allowed to determine for himself his own best interest and that, if attorneys are available, they must be available for all who desire them.

But suppose that there are only enough attorneys to handle half of the cases, the experimenter says. Then why cannot a random assignment schedule be employed to determine which cases they will handle? No, it is countered, a fairer method would be to decide which cases can most benefit from the services of an attorney and to see that these are given representation. Would anyone object, the experimenter counters, if the foundation grant had allowed for the hiring of ten attorneys and all ten were assigned to one court, while in a neighboring jurisdiction no lawyers were assigned, and then comparing the results between the two sites? If this seems reasonable, then certainly it must be reasonable to use other arbitrary techniques of denying representation for the greater good of science and the acquisition of experimental knowledge.

In such matters, the delicate ethical problems of correctional research become evident. Perhaps the only resolution lies in a series of loose dicta. The unjust vagaries of human existence are one thing. The matter at hand is that an experimenter is under the obligation to inflict no further injury or deprivation upon his subjects than necessary, and that the ends of science are irrelevant if they contribute to unreasonable human hurt. Presumably, it must be given to the intelligence and to the conscience of the individual researcher to fill in the teasingly non-specific components of his ethical obligations.

Necessity for Informed Consent

Informed consent by an offender who participates in a correctional experiment vitiates to some extent the allegations that his captive condition is being exploited for scientific ends, that he is being manipulated as an object rather than treated as a human being. Informed consent means consent given by subject who has been provided with adequate information regarding the nature of the experiment, who is fully aware of the possible outcome, and who is free to choose alternative courses without incurring the risk of added disabilities.

There are major difficulties involved in the matter of informed consent in correctional experimentation. For one thing, it often appears self-defeating to convey to the subject the nature of the experimental undertaking, because such information is apt to distort the outcome. As Campbell has indicated:

> In any of the experimental designs, the respondents can become aware that they are participating in an experiment, and this awareness can have an interactive effect, in creating reactions to X which would not occur had X been encountered without this "I'm a guinea pig" attitude. . . .

> Such effects limit generalization to respondents having this awareness and preclude generalizations to the population encountering X with non-experimental attitudes. The direction of the effect may be one of negativism, such as an unwillingness to admit to any persuasion or change.[3]

In addition, there are correctional experiments in which the deliberate aim is to hide from the subject what is being done to him in order to arouse anxiety and thus, it is hoped, to impel him toward what is believed to be a more mature and enabling confrontation of the necessity for him to resolve his own difficulties, rather than to depend upon previous self-defeating modes of adaptation.[4] Presumably, under such conditions, informed consent could extend only to acceptance of the rather vague outline of the program, not to its underlying camouflaged elements. Since the outcome is apt to be quite uncharted, little could be told the subject regarding the possible benefit or harm of participation. It is arguable whether such an experiment meets minimum requirements of ethical acceptability, but it seems clear that the subject would have to be accorded the option of leaving the experiment at any time, with no penalty attached to such departure.

In addition, of course, restriction of subjects to volunteers, particularly in correctional research, may undercut the usefulness of the experimental findings. A stricture consistently leveled against Synanon, the facility in California run by former narcotic addicts for addicts, is that its subjects are highly motivated toward success; in fact, that the screening process deliberately excludes persons who do not appear to possess adequate desire to remain drug-free. Under such conditions, claims by Synanon that various elements of its program are productive of success and that its program has general utility for the treatment of addiction, are susceptible to the charge that its work has demonstrated only that persons who desire strongly enough to cease use of narcotics are able to do so, to an unknown extent (for Synanon is inordinately vague about its success and failure rate). Corrections is more apt to want to know whether a given arrangement can benefit all of its clientele or stipulated segments of it — not merely whether it is advantageous for volunteers — because corrections is obligated not only to aid the individual but also to protect society from harm and from unnecessary expense.

Informed consent also implies that there be no coercion involved in an experimental subject's participation. Direct coercion is, of course, rather readily recognized, but the particularly vulnerable status of correctional subjects makes them notably susceptible to subtler forms of persuasion. It is clearly established in the law that confessions induced by hints of leniency cannot be regarded as voluntary statements, though the translation of this fundamental principle to correctional research poses difficult issues.

Perhaps the point might be illustrated by the use of prisoners in medical experimentation, for it is in the area of medicine that the subject of ethical behavior has received its most intense scrutiny and soul-searching examination. In the United States, the first use of correctional subjects for medical experiments took place at the Mississippi state prison in 1914, when researchers

---

[3] Donald T. Campbell, "Factors Related to the Validity of Experiments in Social Settings," *Psychological Bulletin*, LIV (1967), 304.

[4] See La Mar Empey and Jerome Rabow, "The Provo Experiment in Delinquency Rehabilitation," *American Sociological Review*, XXVI (1961), 679, and the subsequent exchange of letters in XXVII (1962), 256.

attempted to discover the relationship between diet and pellagra.[5] The Governor of Mississippi promised pardons to persons volunteering for the experiment. The situation may be contrasted to a more recent experiment in New York in which eight prisoners were inoculated with a venereal infection in order to test possible cures. For their voluntary participation, the subjects in their own words "got syphilis and a carton of cigarettes." [6]

It is difficult to draw a hard line at the point where the hope of reward moves from the realm of the reasonable into that of the unreasonable. All human behavior includes self-serving elements. The suspect who confesses may do so to relieve feelings of guilt, to avoid further questioning, to gain attention or to obtain the quixotic satisfaction involved in pleasing one's accusers. As Justice Holmes suggested: "Nature makes self-love an instrument of altruism and martyrdom, but the self-lover is not required to know it, although he is more intelligent if he does." [7]

The hope of favorable parole action may seem quite acceptable motivation for voluntary participation in an experimental undertaking, both to the prisoner and to the experimenter. Ivy has suggested as a working rule the following proposition:

> An excessive reduction which would exercise influence in obtaining the consent of prisoners to serve as subjects would be inconsistent with the principle of voluntary participation.[8]

Presumably such words as "excessive" and "undue" have to undergo meticulous examination in terms of the nature of the experiment and its risks, as well as in terms of the correctional status of the volunteer. It is probably sufficient for the moment to reiterate a principle often overlooked in correctional research that, for a desperate man, hope of reward is apt to undercut his freedom of choice and the requirement of voluntary participation necessary as an ethical stipulation for correctional research.

Lessons from medicine provide corollary guidelines for correctional research. The experiments on human subjects, many of them convicted criminals, which were conducted during the Hitler regime by medical doctors, will always serve as a reminder of the potential abuse inherent in power given to the state over captive groups.[9] Standing beside these gruesome episodes in medical annals are stirring examples of research designed for human betterment that were conducted with rigid ethical etiquette. Suffice it to mention, as a suggestion for correctional researchers, the example of Walter Reed, who participated as a subject in his own experiments on yellow fever because he could ask no subject to undergo anything that he himself was not willing to suffer.

---

[5] Joseph Goldberger, "Pellagra: Causation and a Method of Prevention," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, LXVI (1916), 471; Goldberger and G. A. Wheeler, "Experimental Pellagra in White Male Convicts," *Archives of Internal Medicine*, XXV (1920), 451. Cf. the account by Ralph L. Smith, "Research behind Bars," *New York Times Magazine*, Dec. 4, 1960.

[6] Quoted by Howard A. Rusk in "Medical Research and Prisoners," *New York Times*, Nov. 15, 1962.

[7] Quoted by Mark DeWolfe Howe in *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1963) II, p. 49.

[8] A. C. Ivy, "History and Ethics of the Use of Human Subjects in Medical Research," *Science*, CVIII (July 2, 1948), 5. Dr. Ivy was responsible for drawing up the provisions of the Nuremberg Code on this subject, which were based on his experiences at the Nuremberg war crimes trials. See also Irving Ladimer and Roger W. Newman, eds., *Clinical Investigation in Medicine: Legal, Ethical, and Moral Aspects* (Boston: Law-Medicine Institute, Boston University, 1963); Henry K. Beecher, "Ethics and Clinical Research," *New England Journal of Medicine*, CCLXXIV (1966), 1354; and Note, "Legal Implications of Psychological Research with Human Subjects," *Duke Law Journal* (1960), 265.

[9] See Fredric Wertham, "The Geranium in the Window" in *A Sign for Cain* (New York: Macmillan, 1966).

For the Benefit of the Subject

In the absence of voluntary consent — either because it is unavailable or because the nature of the experiment precludes its being sought — no correctional subject should be required to participate in an experimental program that does not redound to his advantage, both as he and as impartial persons would be apt to see that advantage. In corrections, this principle demands that no added restraints be placed upon persons for experimental purposes. A new condition of parole, designed to test its efficacy, could not be imposed upon a random sample of parolees, nor could sentences arbitrarily be increased to 15 instead of 9 months in order to measure deterrent impact. The requirement demands that careful attention be paid to the relative advantages of correctional dispositions and particularly to the subjects' convictions concerning these advantages.

There is, of course, something of a dilemma implicit even in so straightforward a principle because it neglects the relative disadvantage falling upon persons unfortunate enough not to fall within the experimental group. It is possible to suggest that such persons are suffering no consequences which ordinarily would not have come their way; perhaps, for example, they had been sentenced to a 15-month prison term. If so, they should have anticipated serving the usual amount of time involved in their sentence. That their confreres, drawn by random lot, are being released much earlier is not their ill fortune but rather the others' good fortune. So the matter would appear in logic. To the unchosen inmate, however, it may seem quite different and, interestingly enough, such perception might provide another of those experimental situations where the design itself conditions the results of the experiment. Persons released early may perform in superior fashion only as they perceive such beneficence as a matter of luck; those left behind may do less well only so long as they view their misfortune as a testament of the cold-blooded random-number mentality of the system.

Fewer ethical issues are presented when eased conditions — or even harsher conditions — are imposed upon *all* persons falling into the categories effected. Constitutional requirements of equal protection are usually met when correctional conditions, imposed as part of administrative discretion, bear some reasonable relationship to the end being sought. In practice, most correctional change encompasses all relevant subjects uniformly, with common sense — that is, the view that "it certainly sounds like a good idea" — or work done elsewhere, such as in mental hygiene, providing the impetus for rearrangements. Evaluative work, of necessity, depends upon measurement of subsequent outcomes in comparison to those prevalent prior to the inauguration of the new program. The difficulty, of course, is that extrinsic circumstances rather than program ingredients may have conspired to produce the results.

Such possibilities pressure the researcher into demands for experimental-control research designs, despite anguished cries by service personnel that it is despicable to deprive claimants of services which are obviously — or, at least, almost obviously — of merit. Experimenters may recall the early days of work with the Salk vaccine when only first-graders were inoculated as part of the task of determining the value of the new drug, because only a limited amount of the vaccine was available. Purists in the ranks of science might insist that only a random sample of first-graders should have been included in the experiment. Parents of children below school age and of children in other grades who that year contracted infantile paralysis are not likely to gain

solace from lectures regarding the value of pure research or the requirements of controlled experimentation. For correctional researchers, the polio experience may provide grim support for the thesis that verified knowledge is sometimes dependent upon rigid adherence to an adequate research undertaking. But, researchers should also keep in mind, sound ethics requires that experimental-control designs be undertaken only when alternative evaluative methods clearly fall short of requirements. If adequate alternatives are possible, experimental-control designs should be used only when limited resources are all that are available.

Summary and Conclusions

There are few legal restraints upon experimentation with prisoners, probationers and parolees, and juveniles largely because there exist few sophisticated court considerations of the due process implications of these statutes.[10] Tort law suggests that persons may be treated in diverse ways, within limits, so long as their treatment is related to some reasonable therapeutic theory.[11] Untoward consequences generally will not result in liability if the authorities were acting satisfactorily in terms of their delegated responsibility. Thus, when a prisoner escaped from a minimum security farm and procured a weapon with which he threatened a civilian, who died of a brain hemorrhage possibly brought on by fright, the court dismissed the claim for damages from the state for its alleged negligence. It would be against public policy, the judgment stated, to "dissuade the wardens and principal keepers of our prison system from continuing experimentation with 'minimum security' work details which provide means for encouraging better-risk prisoners to . . . prepare themselves for their eventual return to society." [12]

Nonetheless, administrative discretion is no excuse for the neglect of ethical considerations in correctional research. For one thing, it is evident that the courts are beginning to look much more intensely at those areas of criminal justice heretofore peripheral to appellate scrutiny, and that due process protections will inevitably be extended into the prisons and parole in the manner that they recently have been catapulted into the juvenile court.[13] Clearly the days are numbered, for instance, for such administrative judgments as that in a recent case in a western state. In this case, which is probably not atypical, a twice-convicted burglar, sentenced for a period of three to fourteen years, was accused by prison authorities of sodomy. He was tried in the county court and acquitted. Though burglars normally are released in three or four years, the prisoner was retained for the maximum period of his sentence, with the justification that it would be a disservice to society to permit a known aggressive homosexual to be set loose.

The ethical difficulties involved in correctional research lie predominantly in the nature of corrections as a social enterprise. Corrections has recourse to diverse forms of suasion, such as reward and argumentation, but, most persuasively, it uses force and deprivation to achieve its aims. Its goal is fairly

---

[10] Cf. Sanford F. Kadish, "The Advocate and the Expert Counsel in the Correctional Process," *Minnesota Law Review*, XLV (1961), 803. See generally Norval Morris and Colin Howard, "Penal Sanctions and Human Rights" in *Studies in Criminal Law* (New York: Oxford, 1964); Paul A. Freund, "Is the Law Ready for Human Experimentation?" *Annals of Psychology*, XXII (1967), 394; Oscar M. Ruebhausen and Orville G. Brim, "Privacy and Behavioral Research," *Columbia Law Review*, LXV (1965), 1184.

[11] See *Jackson v. Burnham*, 20 Colo. 532, 39 Pac. 557 (1895), and Note, "Legal Implications of Psychological Research with Human Subjects," *Duke Law Journal* (1960), 265.

[12] *Williams v. State*, 308 N.Y. 548, 127 N.E. 2d 545 (1955).

[13] *In re Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1966). See also Comment, "Rights of Prisoners While Incarcerated," *Buffalo Law Review*, XV (1965), 397.

clear: to protect the society by deterring convicted persons and others from engaging in illegal conduct. Ethical difficulties emerge most pointedly when the aim becomes so insistent that it blurs judgment of the means by which it is being achieved or may acceptably be achieved.

In the United States, the most pressing ethical concern of corrections appears to involve the utilization of programs upon involuntary subjects who do not adequately comprehend them. Presumably no correctional program employing suasion beyond that point at which it can be demonstrated that such suasion produces a desirable result should be allowed to continue. Programs must be examined in terms of whether they achieve things which would not occur were they absent. Unless it is clear that persons choosing to avoid group therapy and educational programs, for instance, represent more serious threats to the society without having such experiences than they do with them, it would appear indefensible to require these activities on an involuntary basis. Obviously there is an amount of coercion necessary for the maintenance of any operation, and it is reasonable to expect that individuals do certain things or do without other things. But this is not the same as deprivation of free choice based on unsubstantiated claims of social advantage.

There are a number of concluding observations which may set the subject into clearer perspective. They insist upon the importance of research, but upon research tied to ethical responsibility. They warn us that well-meaning attempts to aid individuals against their will may be a form of tyranny and, if so, should be zealously resisted. Finally, they suggest that, however vital and important a goal scientific exactitude and experimentation may be, there are dangers inherent in uncritical adherence to its values, as there are in uncritical adherence to any dogma.[14]

Justice Holmes, among many others, has pointed out the pressing need for experimentation in the area of criminal justice: "What have we better than a blind guess to show that the criminal law in its present form does more good than harm?" Holmes asked. "Do we deal with criminals on proper principles? Is it idle to talk of deterring the criminal by the classical method of imprisonment?" [15]

George Santayana, approaching the matter from another side, entered further reservation about programs without specified and monitored purpose. "Fanatics," Santayana said, "are those who redouble their effort when they have forgotten their goal." [16] What can happen under such circumstances was indicated by Holmes' colleague, Louis D. Brandeis.

> Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding.[17]

---

[14] See further Richard A. Brymer and Buford Farris, "Ethical and Political Dilemmas in the Investigation of Deviance: A Study of Juvenile Delinquency" in Gideon Sjoberg, ed., *Ethics, Politics, and Social Research* (Boston: Schenkman, 1967), 297-318; and Solomon Kobrin, "Legal and Ethical Problems of Street Gang Work," *Crime and Delinquency*, X (1964), 152.

[15] Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., *Collected Legal Papers* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1921), pp. 188-89.

[16] Quoted in Walter Gellhorn, *American Rights* (New York: Macmillan, 1960), p. 94.

[17] *Olmstead v. U.S.*, 277 U.S. 479 (1927).

THE TESTABILITY OF CORRECTIONAL GOALS

Clarence C. Sherwood

Modern penology appears to be generally agreed, in theory if not always in practice, that the primary goal of corrections is just that — correction — however vaguely it may usually be defined. Although correctional systems and institutions are, of course, given other tasks to perform, such as the secure custody and humane treatment of incarcerated offenders, there is a clear and growing commitment to rehabilitation as a goal. There is also growing, if reluctant, agreement that corrections does not at the present time know how to go about successfully rehabilitating offenders. This general lack of knowledge exists even if in fact rehabilitation is actually taking place within one or more correctional systems. There are at least two basic reasons for this rather sad state of affairs: (1) no general, workable, agreed-upon definition of the meaning of rehabilitation has been developed; and (2) with very few exceptions, procedures have not been built into correctional systems for finding out whether rehabilitation is taking place.

The testability of correctional goals clearly depends, therefore, upon how well the goals are thought through, conceptualized, and ultimately operationalized, and upon the extent to which agreement can be obtained concerning what is meant by testability and whether the methodological problems relating to an agreed-upon meaning can be satisfactorily solved. The first is primarily a conceptual problem, the solution of which requires a delicate meshing of community values and the measurement requirements of operational empirical research. The second involves both methodological problems and problems of the allocation of community and correctional resources to the testing of correctional goals.

The problem of the testability of correctional goals can be rephrased as follows: Can empirical methods or procedures be devised whereby a determination can be made as to whether corrections is achieving its objectives? Although this rephrasing probably raises more questions than it answers, it will help to set the boundaries within which an answer may be given to the problem.

Restrictions and Boundaries

First, questions about the effectiveness of corrections as a total system should be avoided for some time to come if the answers are to be based upon any kind of systematically gathered empirical evidence. Until society is willing to release representative samples of convicted offenders without correctional or supervisory concern, a methodology to evaluate the effects of corrections as a total system does not appear to be available. The global judgments that are usually made of corrections are pointless. Critics say, for example, that, because 60 percent of our prisoners commit serious crimes after release, corrections is a failure. Others say that the correct figure is 33 percent, and therefore corrections is a success. Both of these judgments are pretty close to nonsense. By what standard is one "number" designated good and another

---

Mr. Sherwood is director of research, City of New York Department of Correction, and professor of sociology, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York City.

bad? The community may be satisfied with either or both of these figures, but that has nothing to do with the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of corrections. To deal with the latter, something about what the rate would be without corrections must be known. Trying to figure out what the rate is with corrections is proving difficult enough.

Comparisons of the effectiveness of different systems — for example, comparisons of the systems of different countries and even of different states within the United States — should also be avoided. The problem of adjusting properly for differences among the many jurisdictions in definitions, enforcement policies, procedures, efficiency, judicial practices, and many other complicated dimensions of law enforcement and the administration of justice, appears basically unsolvable at the present time.

The first conclusion, then, is that, if correctional goals are to be subjected to empirical test, the goals of corrections must be stated in relativistic terms and the testing must proceed within systems, rather than across systems. For example, the issue must be "lower" rates of recidivism or "better" work performance, not "low" rates of recidivism or "good" work performance. Interest should be in change, in improvement, and not in some arbitrarily selected standard. Since particular systems and programs are givens in the situation, the notion of relative goals means that the objective should not be "successful" programs but "succeeding" systems — systems which are continuously searching for and finding more effective programs. Answers to questions such as these should be sought: Within this particular system, is this method better than that? Is this new way better than that old one, or vice versa? Does this approach or program work better with this "type" of individual than with that "type"?

A change in thinking on the part of the decision-makers and the controllers of funds is required, however, before much more can be done in the way of really testing such goals. Reward should go, not to the system which claims to have achieved some absolute but arbitrary standard of success — e.g., 50 percent of its inmates are law-abiding citizens after release — but to the system which makes a persistent effort to test the relative effectiveness of alternative programs. A rational, serious organization for continued change is required in the system — not change just for the sake of change, for the new is not necessarily better than the old, but change as a part of a constant search for more effective ways of pursuing its goal.

In an examination of what is meant by "improvement" or "greater effectiveness," the notion of change is central. The assumption is that the goals of corrections that are to be tested, whatever they may be, imply change. It is also assumed that corrections is being thought of as a system or set of interventions into the lives of individuals committed to correctional care and that at least one major objective of this system is to intervene in such a way as to produce change in the future behavior of those individuals. And, of course, the assumption is that it is not just change that is being sought, but desirable change.

To illustrate this point, consider one currently rather popular program, special training for correctional officers. If it is accepted that correctional goals should be defined primarily in terms of the future behavior of those subjected to correctional care, then the value of training programs for correctional officers rests upon the extent to which such programs bring about changed behavior on the part of the officers and the extent to which those

changes bring about changes in the future behavior of the inmates. The first part of the sequence may be necessary, but it is by no means sufficient.

A key phrase in the above is "bring about." Both corrections and rehabilitation, as terms, imply not only change but induced change. Two kinds or aspects of change must be carefully distinguished. One is change in the sense of something being different from what it was previously. The second is change in the sense of something being different from what it would have been had something else not intervened. The first is a comparison of what actually happened at two points in time; the second is a comparison of what actually happened at a particular point in time with an estimate of what would have happened without the particular correctional or rehabilitative effort in question. The goals of corrections must be defined in terms of the second kind of change, not the first. Defined from this point of view, the general goal of corrections is to institute programs which bring about behavior on the part of the recipients of the program which is desirably different from the behavior which would have occurred had the individual not participated in the system or special program.

Out of this notion of "different from what would have occurred" emerge the many methodological difficulties which beset evaluation research and which have so many implications for policy and action. For example, a prisoner is released from a penal institution and "goes straight," however "going straight" may be defined. This is a relative factual situation, at least within the limits of the efficiency of our law enforcement system and the accuracy of the information upon which it is based. It is also an example of change: he was a criminal; now he isn't. But it is change of the first type described above. It is not necessarily change of the second type; his going straight cannot be attributed to the correctional process in which he participated or, for that matter, to anything else in particular. This is so because it is not known how he would have behaved had he not participated in the particular correctional system or program to which we might like to, but should not,. attribute his "success." Therefore, for correctional goals to be testable, we must solve to our reasonable satisfaction the basic methodological problem of obtaining satisfactorily accurate estimates of what behavior would have taken place without the particular intervention in which we may be interested at the moment. This methodological problem will be treated in more detail in a latter section of this paper.

Behavior To Be Changed

Turning now to the problem of what kind of behavior we desire to change, this is, of course, a policy question to a large extent. The community, through some governmental or other system, must set the goal or goals. Research comes into the picture in the effort to spell out, to operationalize the goals in such a way that procedures can be developed and implemented which may have some hope of determining the extent to which the system is achieving the goals set for it.

Suppose we take the general goal "the reduction of recidivism" as a starting point. There are at least two important questions that can be raised: (1) what is meant by it — that is, how is it to be specifically defined? and (2) however defined, is this a sensible goal for corrections? One commonly assumed measure of "reduced recidivism" is that the ex-offender does not commit another crime. Presumably it is agreed that this is not an acceptable definition of "reduced recidivism," and that reduced recidivism is not a

matter of whether or not an individual commits additional crimes but whether he commits fewer crimes during some future specified period of time than he would have committed had there not been a special intervention of some sort. And even if the latter version is accepted as a general definition of the kind of behavior we wish to change, there are a number of problems which must be handled rather carefully and explicitly before it can be regarded as a testable goal.

In the first place, we can only know — and even this only within definite limits — that a given individual has committed another crime; we cannot really know that he has not. If a strictly legal position is taken, and we say that he has committed a crime only if he is apprehended and convicted for the commission of a crime, there is still the problem of the availability of such information. The narrowest definition of recidivism is in terms of whether or not the same individual comes back into the same institution or correctional system after having been released from that institution or system at some time in the past. The broadest definition is in terms of whether or not he commits another crime anywhere, whether or not he is apprehended and convicted. The first is testable but unsatisfactory; the second is more satisfactory but untestable in practice. An acceptable, testable definition must therefore be somewhere in between. But most importantly, a minimum list of specific dimensions must be explicitly handled: the length of time after release must be specifically designated; the geographical and jurisdictional boundaries within which behavior is to be checked — other municipalities, counties, states or even countries — must be carefully listed; and the specific categories of behavior which are to be counted must be carefully defined. For example, are drunkenness arrests, parole or probation violations, traffic offenses, or offenses without convictions to count?

In the literature on recidivism, considerable dissatisfaction has been expressed about what we might call the simple definition of recidivism — was or was not the individual convicted of another crime. The alternative most commonly suggested has been that a special emphasis should be placed on the prevention of persistent criminality. Although it is a step in the right direction, persistent criminality also leaves much to be desired as a target concept. For example, how significant a proportion of the community's correctional resources should be devoted to the persistent petty offender or the chronic drunk, the parole or probation violator? At a minimum, at least two other aspects should be included: the seriousness of the criminal act, as seen from the point of view of the community's values, and the violence dimension of the criminal act. It would also be desirable to include — although it will be considerably more difficult to do so — additional aspects of the offender's future behavior, including consequences of his future behavior with respect to members of his family.

If we think in terms of a system of scoring the inmate's behavior while "free" in the community which would include the number of days, months, or years between release and re-conviction or recommitment, the seriousness of the subsequent offenses, if any, the work performance of the ex-offender, and community costs of supporting and caring for members of his family, we would have a more complex but much more socially meaningful definition of a goal for corrections. In the first place, the important dimension of persistence would be automatically included in such a measure; but the measure would also take into consideration the distinction between the

persistent but petty offender and the offender whose criminal behavior may be somewhat less persistent but nevertheless considerably more serious with respect to other citizens in the community or to individuals for whom the offender has responsibility.

The development of such a scoring system will take a considerable amount of doing. Significant resources will have to be devoted to this task and its pursuit should involve policy-makers and administrators from corrections as well as research-oriented social scientists. Although a comparison of correctional systems is not an immediately achievable goal, there is little question but that it would be highly desirable if a generally agreed-upon "goal-measuring" system were adopted by a number of correctional systems. For one thing, a general adoption of such a system of follow-up would provide useful comparative-descriptive information concerning the post-release behavior of former inmates of different correctional systems. Secondly, it could provide the basis for the comparisons of the predictive usefulness of both similar and different types of information which is currently gathered by the various correctional systems. And thirdly, it might provide the basis for a slight modification in the stricture against comparisons of the effectiveness of different systems in that judgments might be possible concerning differential rates of improvement. That is, although we might have to refrain from saying System A is "better" than System B, evidence might be available which would indicate which of them is improving at a faster rate. At the present time, we have very little information concerning the relative effectiveness of different programs within systems; we have no knowledge at all concerning the relative effectiveness of different programs across systems. Such a goal is admittedly somewhat "far out," but is approachable. However, it is approachable only if a common yardstick is adopted across systems.

Following is a revised statement of the problem of the testability of correctional goals, incorporating into that statement the restrictions and boundaries developed in the foregoing discussion:

> Can empirical methods or procedures be devised whereby determination can be made of whether particular correctional systems are improving their ability to bring about desirable change in the future behavior of individuals whom they have been given a responsibility to rehabilitate?

The fulfillment of such a goal requires:

1. A detailed specification of the kinds of behavior in which change is desired, which have been sufficiently operationalized so that quantitative measures or scores can be obtained with a measurable degree of reliability and validity for specified members of the correctional system's target population;

2. A definition of change as a measurable difference between the actual behavior of the experimental population and an estimate of what their behavior would have been without the experimental intervention;

3. Carefully designed and implemented interventions, the effects of which are to be compared with one or more other traditional or experimental methods of attempting to achieve the same rehabilitative goal;

4. Carefully designed evaluation research components built into the over-all experimental rehabilitative effort, including, wherever possible, random allocation of subjects to the various treatment groups;

5. Adequate background data and pre-measures concerning each of the members of the demonstration or study population; and

6. Careful follow-up over a pre-specified period of time during which careful measures would be obtained concerning the goal — the dependent variable — of the particular correctional system.

Available Approaches to Design

The basic and crucial task of the evaluation design or methodology is to provide estimates of how the individuals who are exposed to the experimental programs would have behaved had they not been so exposed. Three basic approaches are available: (1) randomization of individuals to experimental or program groups and to one or more comparison or control groups; (2) the matching of individuals or groups, with some participating in the special program or programs to be evaluated and some not participating; and (3) the statistical equating of experimental and control groups by the analysis of covariance. All three require at least one comparison or control group — a group of individuals comparable to or equated with the groups exposed to the special programs being evaluated.

When individuals are randomly allocated to the various study groups, including at least one control group, the future actual behavior of the control group provides an estimate of what the future behavior of each of the experimental groups would have been had they not been participants in the special programs. Through the chance drawing of individuals for each of the study groups, the assumption is that all variables (or characteristics) are randomly distributed among the groups and therefore that whatever group differences obtain among the groups in terms of their future criterion behavior can be evaluated in terms of the probability of obtaining such differences by chance.

The second approach to making estimates of the future behavior of participants is matching. There are a number of ways of matching: individual matching, frequency distribution matching, and others. In a matching procedure, members of the exposed or experimental group are compared with members of the control group on a category-by-category basis.

In the so-called individual or precision-matching procedure, individuals are selected from the population in pairs, triplets, etc. (depending upon how many groups are being compared) on the basis of their similarity with respect to a set of pre-selected characteristics or variables. Two basic decisions have to be made in matching: one is the selection of the variables; and the second is the basis for matching within variables. For example, if age is one of the variables selected, individuals could be precision-matched by date of birth (very high precision indeed), by whole years of age, or by over or under some particular age, such as under-21 and 21-or-over. Whatever the decisions, there is a resulting set of individually matched groups, the actual future behavior of which can be compared. The members of each pair (or triplet, etc.) who did not participate in the special program or programs being evaluated provide the basis for the estimate of the future behavior of those who did. In frequency matching, the experimental and control groups are matched on the basis of the distributions of each matching variable. Various statistical tests — which ones depend in large part on the nature of the measurement of the "future behavior," the criterion measure — can then be applied to whatever differences may have occurred among the compared groups on the criterion variable.

The third approach, the attempt to equate statistically the various study groups by the technique of the analysis of covariance, involves a combination of regression analysis — multiple regression if more than one predictor variable

is used — and the analysis of variance. The mean scores on the criterion variable (some kind of post-release behavior score) for each of the groups to be compared are statistically adjusted on the basis of weights obtained by multiply-regressing selected predictor variables — such as number of previous convictions, seriousness of last crime, age at first conviction, etc. — against the dependent or criterion variable. The significance of the differences between the adjusted mean scores of the compared groups is then tested by the analysis of variance. Within the limits of the predictive power of the variables used in the multiple-regression equation, this adjustment procedure takes into consideration initial differences in the probability of desirable outcome for the compared groups in making a determination of the impact of the intervention.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Available Approaches

Each of the three approaches has different advantages and disadvantages.

A major advantage of the random design is that it does not depend upon previous knowledge concerning which variables are importantly related to the outcome variable, and it controls for all variables, known or unknown, as well as possible under most circumstances. In addition, powerful statistical tools are clearly legitimately applicable to the analysis of random designs. Random designs also allow for the problem of representativeness, at least within the population samples, to be taken into consideration. For example, if we want to test the effectiveness of a pre-release employment counseling program, random samples of all releasees on a consecutive basis can be taken and counseling given to one or more of the samples. Different types or different amounts of counseling could also be compared. And since samples of the total population were involved, the results of the study would be applicable to all the inmates released from that system during the period of the study. If the study went on long enough and evidence could be obtained which indicated no important shifts in the characteristics of the releasees over time, there would be reasonable grounds for assuming that the program would work as the findings indicated on all inmates received and released by that system.

The random design is only applicable, obviously, to a prospective-type design. The random design is also limited in another not usually recognized way. It provides a basis only for a test of the effectiveness of exposure to experimental programs; it does not automatically take into consideration differences in response among the participants in the program — such as completion of the program or satisfactory or unsatisfactory completion of the program. Since satisfactory and unsatisfactory completors of a program are not going to be random samples of the originally random experimental group, some other device is needed if an analysis is to be made of the possibly differential effects of completing or not completing a program. In the simple random design, all the experimentals must be compared with all the controls, whether or not the experimental subjects "learned," "responded well," "took counseling advice," etc. It is for important sub-questions such as these that the analysis of covariance approach can make important contributions to the kind of information obtained from action-research efforts.

The simple random design also often runs into difficulty when attrition occurs in the follow-up samples. This is particularly crucial methodologically when there is differential follow-up of the experimentals and the controls emanating from some feature of the program itself. This is likely to be particularly prevalent in programs which include post-release services and the

system, by the very nature of the program, maintains better information of the whereabouts of the experimentals as compared with the controls. It is a rare study where criterion information is not missing on some members of the study population. When this is differentially true for the experimental and the control group, additional equating procedures are needed. The analysis of covariance is ideally suited to handle this problem.

The matching approach has the advantages of being applicable in a retrospective design and also of not requiring any assumptions about the form of the relationship between each of the control or matching variables and the criterion variable — including especially the degree of linearity in the relationships. The disadvantages of the matching approach include: (a) the problem of representativeness, and (b) the large number of cases that are required to control for even a relatively small number of variables at the same time. Since the matching procedures in retrospective designs eliminate the unmatchable individuals, the resulting comparison samples are representative of neither the over-all population from which they were selected nor even of the population exposed to the intervention.

But probably the most serious disadvantage is that the more precisely one desires to match the experimental and control groups, the larger the number of cases which are required. In retrospective designs, this means that an evaluation using matched groups can only be applied to experiments with large participant populations and at least equally large non-participant populations from which to draw matched controls. If relatively crude matching categories are used, the attrition of cases will be less, but there will be more question as to whether the variables were actually adequately controlled. Frequency distribution matching is subject to the same criticism; it retains cases at the cost of precision.

A major advantage of the analysis of covariance adjustment approach is that all available cases — participants and non-participants — can be used in the analysis. There need be no attrition of cases except for the unavailability of information. Furthermore, there is theoretically no limit to the number of variables which can be used as controls (that is, as covariance adjustors), although in practice the number which will contribute significantly to the multiple regression equation is likely to be small. In any event, the number of variables used as adjustors does not affect the number of cases used in the analysis.

A major problem with the covariance approach centers around the extent to which good predictor variables, or adjustors, can be found. This problem also exists with the matching approach but often appears to be less of a problem because the importance of the matching variables selected is usually assumed rather than measured.

Requirements for Future Action

In conclusion, if correctional goals are to be both testable and subjected to adequate and useful evaluation, a considerable expenditure of effort and resources is going to be required within at least three related areas.

1. A high priority should be given to the development of operationalized goal variables. An agreed-upon system for scoring the post-release behavior of recipients of correctional services should meet the requirements of both sound empirical measurement and the substantive interests of the administrators and policy-makers in the correctional field.

2. Significant resources — talent, time, and funds — should be devoted to what might be called research on evaluation research. The same experimental programs should be evaluated according to several evaluative approaches and a comparison made of the conclusions indicated by the different approaches. Intensive study along these lines would delineate much more clearly the differences among the methods, their strengths and weaknesses. The same experimental programs should be evaluated both prospectively and retrospectively, with the retrospective design restricted to more traditional types of information and to specially selected samples. Such studies would reveal much more clearly and empirically whatever special dangers may exist in drawing conclusions on the basis of retrospective designs and on the basis of non-random designs. And finally, research on research would undoubtedly accelerate the development of still newer and hopefully better evaluative procedures.

3. Significant resources should be devoted to the development of as definitive and useful a list of "information" variables as we can possibly produce, to serve as guidelines for the establishment of comparable information-gathering procedures across systems. At the present time, there is clearly great variation in the amount, quality, and types of information obtained and recorded about inmates and similar populations. Much of what is gathered is hardly used at all. Once relatively standardized data-gathering procedures are agreed upon and their uses clearly demonstrated, the data situation in corrections will undoubtedly improve considerably. A basic criterion for the incorporation of a particular variable (type of information) in the list should be its predictive power with respect to an established and adopted criterion variable.

Evaluation research in the real world of social action is a relatively new discipline and is confronted by difficulties not normally encountered in more traditional research endeavors. But it is also, in this writer's opinion, being increasingly recognized for the importance of its potential contribution to a rational societal attack on the social problems of our time. But to be really useful it must be done well. That more efficient ways of allocating rehabilitative resources in the correctional field are needed and the potential contribution of evaluation research toward that end have been basic assumptions of this paper. The focus has been on some of the problems that must be solved and the kinds of effort that must be expended before it can be a fully effective tool in correctional policy-making, planning, and action.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES FOR RESEARCH IN CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION

Kenneth Polk

Much as we might like to think of research as some type of mystical artistic enterprise, in reality the research product is heavily influenced by the organizational setting within which investigation takes place. Research in corrections or any other field requires decisions which derive from an administrative structure. By direct implication, then, the issue of power is raised. The way that power is employed sets the conditions which determine whether or not effective research will be accomplished.

Nothing is more basic in correctional research than administrators' attitudes toward it. Research has been defined in simple terms as "merely trying to find out things." If the organization itself is oriented to asking questions aimed at "finding out things," then research possibly can be accomplished. All too often, however, correctional organizations have little real interest in finding out things about their programs.

Most correctional agencies, in common with other social service agencies, do not feel a commitment to public accountability whereby they accept as routine the task of assessing the success or failure of their programs. In such systems, mere provision of services of one sort or another, rather than the successful accomplishment of some behavioral outcome, becomes the major goal. As a consequence, little attention is given to the role of research as it serves to demonstrate the effective or ineffective functioning of the institution.

Effective research can be done only if the administration supports such research. Such support requires not only the provision of necessary physical and personnel resources but a supportive ideology as well. Ideally, what is required is an organization that possesses what might be called a reflexive research reaction, where emergent problems within the organization are seen as research questions. Solutions to problems, in other words, are sought within the framework of empirical research. Without such supporting resources and ideology, it is extremely likely that the research efforts will become isolated bureaucratically and serve little useful purpose to the organization.

Difficulties of Research in Corrections

Proper organizational structure for research must take into account what research really is. Stripped to its bare essentials, what scientific research tries to do is to find the answer to a very simple question: Was a certain effect on one element in a situation produced by some other element? In other words, did X cause Y? When the researcher has developed a hypothesis that X does have a certain effect on Y, he then has to do three things. First, he must design research that will test his hypothesis. Then he must make the observations his design calls for. Finally, he must analyze the data he has collected by observation to determine whether they confirm or deny his hypothesis.

Such a statement is, of course, deceptively simple when applied to any research situation, but especially when applied to research in correctional

Mr. Polk is associate professor of sociology, University of Oregon.

rehabilitation. Here the Y we are concerned with is the rehabilitation of offenders. But, as many preceding speakers have pointed out, there is very little agreement on what Y actually is. What is the desired outcome of a given correctional program? Until it is clearly identified, there can be no ascertaining the effects of X upon it.

A second difficulty in correctional research is to form a hypothesis to test. In scientific fields, a researcher forms his hypothesis on the basis of accepted theories. But theories are notoriously at odds with one another in corrections.

Third, it is difficult to design research in correctional rehabilitation because any research on human beings involves both ethical and methodological problems. Dr. Geis has pointed out the nature of the ethical problem. As to methodology, most of the problem hinges on whether or not there can be some form of random assignment to the program which is being investigated. Usually, however, a correctional system is required to take in and treat offenders in such a way that random assignment is not possible. This creates the need for alternative designs that will tax the ingenuity and competence of the best-trained researcher.

Fourth, on the basis of the design selected, observations will have to be made which permit the test of the hypothesis that X produces effects on Y. This means that, in correctional rehabilitation research, it will be necessary to trace changes in the effect variables, but in addition it will be necessary to trace changes in the program variables. Correctional research is often complex, and it is all too easy to focus simply on observation of the Y (or effect) variables. Yet it is certainly true that, if we are to emerge from a correctional program with any meaningful and useful knowledge, we are going to need detailed information about what it was that brought about any changes observed. It is not sufficient to know that some effect has been produced. We must know how it came about. The history of many correctional research enterprises is such that little or no observation is made on the program. The lack of such observations becomes even more critical when there are clear and obvious changes in the focus and methods of the program over time.

Fifth, experimental data must be analyzed and interpreted. Again, in correctional research this can be a complex task. On the one hand, it requires skill and technique in analysis and interpretation. At the same time, however, meaningful interpretation of research findings demands a familiarity with the program and its assumptions, procedures, and techniques.

Hazards of Poor Organizational Structure

With this overly simplified outline of the research tasks in mind, we can now shift to the questions of the administrative and organizational structures appropriate for correctional research. We might start this discussion by considering one kind of organizational structure that is at best weak and may well be completely unworkable. This is the kind of evaluation effort where the program staff is housed in one place (usually some kind of action agency) and the research staff is housed somewhere else (most often in a university).

Why is this common model unworkable? It is unworkable fundamentally because it separates two things that cannot be separated. If the program is designed to answer questions, then *all* staff are engaged in a research enterprise. Research and program staff are, in the ideal case, both part of a research effort. When the program and research functions are separately or-

ganized and independently administered, a number of occurrences are common. Among them are these:

1. There is often either "looseness" of agreement or actual disagreement as to what the goals of the program are. In one recent instance out of my own experience, a community developed a family service project under the anti-poverty program, which had separate program and research staffs. Late in the life of the project, it was discovered that the outcome viewed as important to the research staff — namely, changes in income level — was viewed as irrelevant by the program staff, who had focused on internal family dynamics. In this case the problem was particularly critical. Lack of funds had necessitated that program staff take on data collection tasks. Since the program unit had defined income data as irrelevant, these data were not collected. Needless to say, the absence of this information posed significant difficulties for the research design.

2. Research and program staff, when separated, may not share the same hypothesis or theory. This becomes especially problematic over the lifetime of an action program. The "realities" of program execution require various kinds of changes in the structure of services as the project unfolds. These changes often represent implicit alteration in the theoretical framework of the program. As a consequence, the evaluation ultimately may produce an inadequate test of the wrong hypothesis.

3. Separated research and program staff can run into further trouble in the area of research design and design maintenance. For example, program and research budgets and staffing will be designed so that both staffs start their work at the same time, and thus the program is well under way before the research staff can put into final shape the research design and instruments needed for evaluation. Such a situation hardly guarantees conditions for adequate evaluation. Often lack of communication between the staffs can lead to changes in the design by program staff, changes which alter the logic and integrity of the evaluation design. From my own experience, I have seen such things as program staff changing the criteria for entrance into the program, changing areas affected by the program, changing the kinds of programs given to experimental and control groups — all without prior clearance with the research staff, often without even notifying them. Such practices reduce evaluation reports to nonsensical exercises with meaningless data.

4. Observations are also affected by the separation of program and research functions. From one point of view, the valuable contributions of program staff regarding how best to observe the program and its effects may be lost. From the other point of view, if research staff impose observational demands on program staff, the latter are apt to take a "nuisance" view of reporting, with consequent neglect and sloppiness. It takes at least a magician to make any sense out of such data.

Interpretation also suffers from this same problem. Research staff may complete a tight and rigorous evaluation report that suffers from one unfortunate weakness: it has little to do with the actual program. From the other side, program staff often suffer from what might be called "program mystique," *i.e.*, the belief that their program had an effect despite existence of overwhelming negative data. In part this stems from the kind of organization where commitment to "success" outweighs an intellectually honest and rigorous search for verifiable solutions to the given problem. A reciprocal "research

mystique" also is generated by the separation of program and research functions when researchers cloak themselves in the shadowy garments of their techniques and jargon. In the eyes of the program staff, this gives researchers an alien appearance at best. When coupled with "scientific neutrality" (*i.e.*, lack of commitment to success of program or agency), researchers' attitudes are perceived by program staff as downright dangerous.

Need for Integration of Research and Program

Instead of this separation, I am arguing here for a close integration of research and program efforts. To be sure, there are specialized tasks and techniques which require division of research and program effort. If the program is organized over-all as a research effort, within an oganizational setting which gives an important role to research, the ultimate effect should be answers to pressing problems.

There are any number of possible organizational models which might be chosen for carrying out research in correctional rehabilitation. Private industry has emerged in recent years as an important potential resource for such programs. Such organizations offer the advantage of an orientation toward efficiency and technology which is grossly absent in many public agencies. This, unfortunately, must be balanced off by the ignorance and atheoretical and non-ideological orientation of industry to the problems of the correctional field. The attitude that "we can do the job for wholesale prices" should be viewed with equal skepticism when buying household items or correctional programs. In both areas the ultimate cost may be much higher.

The universities, of course, are also a resource for research. In universities we find some of the best minds and most highly refined techniques in the research field. It is unfortunate that much of these resources are better fitted to the nineteenth than to the twentieth century. While our cities burn, our poor suffer, discrimination continues, war fever spreads, what are the dominant intellectual concerns of the academic community? Psychologists continue their interest in rats, pigeons, and college sophomores, while sociologists persist in developing a rigorous jargon to deal with trivial problems. The knowledge possessed by social science, and certainly the scientific methodologies of the various disciplines, offer much to corrections. Meaningful research inevitably would benefit both the university community and the field of corrections.

Existing correctional agencies offer the advantages of knowledge of the problem, access to the target populations, and clear legal responsibility for action in correctional rehabilitation. Unfortunately, what passes for knowledge is often, as others have noted, merely accumulated ignorance. The sum of a series of zeroes is still zero. Further, these agencies are most vulnerable to the "program mystique" problem, believing with deep conviction in the goodness and effectiveness of their programs. The fact that such beliefs can be maintained in the face of the overwhelming array of negative evidence provides a living monument to man's capacity for self-deception. At the same time, it presents a very real problem in the conduct of effective correctional research programs.

Summary and Conclusion

This discussion, then, should make clear the difficulty in deciding upon the appropriate kinds of research structures. Above all else, we must realize that only through adequate research can we find adequate answers to our questions. The demands of the research process dictate a close interlocking of

research and program effort. This interlocking will provide for the proper scheduling of the total project activities, as such activities are influenced by research needs. This may mean that much more time is spent in both planning and analysis than is spent for the actual program; this is often necessary to provide for adequate research operations.

Whatever else has been said, I hope it is clear that I think research is important to the field of corrections and that research is not simply the business of "researchers." The quality of research is more often established by administrative officials, persons who, we can hope, will come to see themselves as central to the research process.

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSPECTIVES ON RESEARCH IN CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION

Herman G. Moeller Ben S. Meeker
Louie L. Wainwright E. Preston Sharp
Robert H. Fosen, Moderator

Mr. Fosen:

When we were planning this seminar, the committee agreed that it was essential to have some top correctional administrators give us their views on research in correctional rehabilitation. This would be necessary if researchers were to understand the situation into which we hope they will be moving in larger numbers. It is our hope that this meeting may help to hasten the process whereby administration and research can get together and share common objectives.

I will introduce the speakers and, following their presentations, attempt to identify some dominant themes.

Herman G. Moeller is assistant director for community services, U. S. Bureau of Prisons.

Ben S. Meeker is chief U. S. probation officer in Chicago and director of the Federal Probation Training Center located there.

Louie L. Wainwright is director of the Florida Division of Corrections.

E. Preston Sharp is general secretary of the American Correctional Association.

Mr. Moeller:

Yesterday's sessions represent real evidence of the ferment in corrections today and of its growing interface with other community services which are concerned with human need and human resources. This meeting also underlines the kind of recognition which corrections is now developing of the necessity for research and program evaluation. I think it would be safe to say that such a meeting would not have been feasible ten years ago. The fact that it is feasible today is due in large measure to the activities of a few correctional systems in focusing on the potentialities of research for aiding correctional programming. Some remarkable work has been done in this area, particularly in the state of California.

Some Basic Themes

As I think back over yesterday's sessions, it seems to me that several major themes emerge. If there was a central theme, it was the need for more adequate information as a research base and the deplorable state of our information systems generally. Too long, corrections has satisfied itself with a kind of bookkeeping operation which counted intake and output and paid very little attention to what went on between these points — to the correctional process itself. Until we have the capacity to identify, at a minimum, the kinds and qualities of programs in which an individual has participated during the correc-

---

Mr. Fosen is research director of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training.

tional process, we will not develop very useful handles for correctional research. A very important aspect of the improvement of information systems is management's critical need to have available the kinds of baseline data which enable the administrator to plan intelligently.

Another basic theme of yesterday's session was the necessity of identifying target groups of offenders and improving our capacity to define the service needs of our clients. Again too long, corrections has been using the blunderbuss instead of the rifle. We have gone on the assumption that offenders are offenders and what is good for one is good for all, without realizing the discrete areas of need among them. The implications of defining target groups and their varying needs relate ultimately to the way in which an institutional administrator will be able to regroup and remold the correctional institution as a resource for meeting need. The same is true of probation and parole. One can be heartened by the fact that in this area there is at least a beginning of tooling up to meet offenders' needs.

A third principal theme was the critical importance of developing more meaningful measures of program effectiveness. Correctional administrators have fallen into the trap of hitching their wagon to the star of the reduction of recidivism as the sole test of program effectiveness. As a result the correctional system has assumed responsibility for the offender from the time he enters the system until he dies. We can't tolerate this any longer in corrections.

John Conrad focused attention on the growing thrust of corrections in the direction of community-based programs. You will recall that the Crime Commission laid strong emphasis on this point. But I'm a little troubled by the possibility that, with all this talk of movement, we are proceeding on assumptions which have not been validated and which obviously need evaluation as we mount new programs.

Mr. Mandell's compelling observations about the lack of programs for the short-term offender in the jail focused attention on that no man's land of corrections which has had almost no serious consideration. This area of need will be particularly significant in the days ahead as the short-term institution becomes less involved with alcoholics and more concerned with other types of offenders.

Another theme which barely surfaced but is very important has to do with manpower needs and the importance of research related to the training of practitioners in new roles. I hope we can talk about this theme this morning.

Potential of Rehabilitation in Corrections

I think this fairly well states the major themes of yesterday's sessions. I should like now to consider this question: Given this spectrum of need and the broad areas of unanswered questions, what are the potentialities for collaboration with the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration in mounting more effective evaluation and demonstration?

So far as information systems are concerned, this seems to me essentially an in-house problem, a problem which belongs to the correctional family and must be addressed by it. But I think we need to examine critically the roles of persons in non-correctional services in relation to the correctional process.

Take, for example, the growing provision of vocational rehabilitation counselors as consultants and adjuncts to institutional staff. We have been navigating essentially by the seat of the pants in using them. Only through some carefully constructed research can we begin to identify the kinds of tasks

which the counselor can most appropriately perform and define more precisely his relationship to the correctional process.

In our task of defining more precisely the indices of changes, vocational rehabilitation has an important contribution to make in showing us the target groups for whom rehabilitation services can and should be provided and those for whom these specialized services are not indicated.

In the whole area of community-based programs we are coming closer to realization of the roles of non-correctional services in corrections. It is going to be important for corrections to test a variety of models for community services. Not all residential community centers should be cut to the same pattern. Opportunities for variations in providing a range of services to differentiated groups of clients are almost unlimited.

Mr. Meeker:

I don't know when I have attended a seminar that I found more provocative and stimulating. I think, however, that it is well to realize that much of what we are doing is relative.

Yesterday someone commented on the disparity of judges' sentencing practices. This is an area about which judges themselves are quite concerned. At a sentencing institute for judges convened in Chicago, studies were conducted before and after the session to see what changes might have occurred in judges' attitudes. We decided then that we ought to test the sentencing attitudes of the non-judicial professionals attending the institute — sociologists, psychologists, social workers, probation officers, etc. What we discovered was that the sentences recommended by these individuals varied just as widely as those of the judges. So no one has "the word," and we have a long way to go to come out with scientific answers.

I was also reminded when we were discussing ethics yesterday of a comment once made by Justice John Vincent Barry of the Supreme Court of Australia, who was previously dean of the law school at Melbourne University. "Well, you know, what is illegal in Canberra and considered unethical in Melbourne, is just good fun in Sydney."

Federal Probation Training Center Research

I am administrator of a fairly good-sized probation agency. I also serve as director of a training program for federal probation officers. This program is conducted at the Federal Probation Training Center which, although a national training service, is directly affiliated with a working court. The center also has an informal but continuing association with the University of Chicago. Because of our proximity to a busy court and a great university, we perhaps have become more sensitive to the need for research. We have done some collaborative research with several universities, and we are now working with VRA's Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program of which Mr. Bell spoke yesterday. The success of all these programs is going to be based largely on communication — that is, careful preparation of staff and continuous communication between research personnel and agency practitioners.

We are just now finishing up a three-year project in collaboration with the University of Chicago. This is a research project under a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, in which the University of Chicago and our staff are taking a look at specific characteristics of offenders.

As some of you may know, the School of Social Service Administration

of the University of Chicago has conducted a series of research projects called "motivation-capacity-opportunity studies." We became interested in seeing how this research method might be applied in the correctional field. Could we measure motivation, capacity, and opportunities of offenders in the community, and could we come up with some results that might be useful to probation officers in practice?

No findings have yet been released, but I can tell you something about our planning to involve not only our own probation staff but also the judges of the court. Those who have not worked in courts have no idea of the difficulties that are sometimes encountered in getting judges to support objective research which may reflect positively or negatively — one cannot anticipate which — on a court service. In this project, we have had strong support from the court, largely because we planned very early to keep the judges in our Federal District Court acquainted with the purposes and conduct of the research.

It was also necessary to hold a number of staff meetings early in the research. If you do not involve staff in the goals and in the process of research, you can expect resistance.

Work with VR Counselors

I can see a broadening of the concept of vocational rehabilitation on the part of the counselors we have been working with. In the past the focus was on the physically disabled or handicapped individual. In the Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program, the VR counselors are finding that they have to work with families, with communities, that they have to look at a broader spectrum of problems, needs, and resources available for rehabilitating the individual.

This has implications for the training of VR counselors. One of them came to our program with training in education. This is a common background — after all, vocational rehabilitation has been an outgrowth of vocational education. But this counselor commented that possibly other types of training need to be given to VR counselors, particularly greater knowledge about the psychology of human behavior.

It also has implications for the role of the counselor. The tendency for anyone who gets into the helping professions is to want to take over the major responsibility for treatment. For example, in our part of the federal offenders program we are working by agreement with women offenders, since we are one of the few probation departments in the federal system which has enough women offenders to make research on them meaningful. So here is a VR counselor looking at a case and discovering that, before she can bring to the woman offender the resources of VRA in terms of helping her to get into an educational program, to be trained as a saleswoman or a secretary or whatever, the counselor has to participate in the process of relieving her of emotional difficulties, perhaps caused by family problems.

Yet the VR counselor's training has not prepared her for this. However, the probation officer, who has been trained for such work or at least trained in knowing where to get this kind of help for the client, has the final responsibility for the case. So we need some pretty clear definition of roles, and we have been making very constructive progress in this task.

Perhaps I should just leave this thought with you: Out of the research program we are conducting will come further understanding of training needs, so that we can bring VR counselors and probation officers together and begin to identify the various roles. We shall also learn how we can best use the VR

counselors. If we can learn this and the counselors also discover what additional skills they need in order to be effective with offenders, we can also begin to use effectively the total array of community resources.

Mr. Wainwright:

To say that the concept of research is new in the field of corrections would be erroneous. The implication is clear, however, that the field of corrections undoubtedly has not really embraced or fully utilized the results of practical, sound research.

I purposely used the word "practical" to give emphasis to my next point. The major portion of research conducted in the correctional field in the past has been done by people outside the field. I believe it would be safe to say that graduate students in the behavioral sciences — people needing a master's thesis or a doctor's dissertation — have conducted most of this research. A very minute percentage of these researchers ever again return to the scene of their crime.

Correctional administrators, for the most part, have been reluctant to incorporate the results of this research into their own frame of reference because, as mentioned by Dr. Sherwood yesterday, too often the research is heavily weighted with theoretical implications, rather than practical application.

Why is most of the research in corrections conducted by people outside the correctional field? Surely there is an awareness by the people in the correctional field that research is a tremendously fertile field and the opportunities are unlimited.

In answer to this question, we come right back to our basic problem: We just don't have sufficient personnel. Our employees who have the know-how to conduct good, sound, scientific, practical research are overwhelmed by the burdens of the day. Our professional personnel cannot keep up as it is with the necessary day-to-day routine, much less devote adequate time to research. Can a classification officer with a caseload of 250 find time to engage in research? Can one psychiatrist in a system handling over 7,000 men find time to do research when he knows that perhaps 500 to 700 of these men would benefit by his services? We have tended to shrug our shoulders and say that the most pressing and immediate needs must be taken care of first.

Yet we have not found out how to make very good connections with perhaps the primary source of help in research, the university. Some clues to our difficulties in this area were offered by Dr. G. Lester Anderson, of the State University of New York in Buffalo, in addressing a meeting on correctional manpower and training needs held in Atlanta last year.

> Anyone who looks at colleges and universities with some objectivity finds them institutions of paradox. They are, for example, at once the most conservative and the most radical of institutions. Threatening the social order at one moment, they seem at another so slow to change in the face of social demands that they completely frustrate the would-be movers and shakers of the established order. This paradox is relevant to your considerations as you are gathered to initiate plans and programs in the field of correctional rehabilitation at the college and university level.[1]

[1] *Manpower for Correctional Rehabilitation in the South* (Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1967), p. 17.

It is perhaps even more relevant in making plans for research in correctional rehabilitation in which we need to involve higher education.

But involve them we must. We must also develop our own research capabilities within corrections itself. These things we have to do if we are to meet public demand for more effective rehabilitation of offenders.

State Plan for Research

One of the ways in which we hope to extend our research efforts in Florida is to have a full-time coordinator of research in the central office of the State Division of Corrections. For the past 2½ years we have had a part-time research consultant who had been for some time a classification officer in one of our institutions. While working part-time as research consultant, he has pursued further academic work at Florida State University, where he will shortly complete work for his Ph.D. degree in corrections and criminology. During this time he has given us consultation and also coordinated the research of graduate students in the University's Department of Criminology and Corrections. Research which has been done by our Division or with its cooperation has included these subjects:

Impact of the Gideon decision on crime and sentencing in Florida.

Effect of short-term group counseling on anxiety and hostility of newly incarcerated inmates.

Development of a theoretical foundation for the use of writs in the resocialization process in a correctional setting.

Relationship of religiosity and criminality.

When our research consultant comes on our staff full-time, we hope to expand our research activities greatly.

Multi-State Research Center

We are now seeking a grant to establish a Southeastern Correctional and Criminology Research Center at Florida State University. The states of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina would work together in this Center. Its governing board would consist of the director of corrections in each of the four states and the head of the University's Department of Criminology and Corrections.

The Center's basic purposes would be:

1. To encourage uniform reporting and data collection;
2. To sponsor and conduct basic research and surveys in the field of corrections;
3. To assemble, correlate, evaluate, and disseminate data, findings, conclusions, and recommendations in the field;
4. To offer consultation and facilitate professional communications among individuals and organizations interested in its purposes; and finally
5. To educate its members and the general public with respect to problems and their solution in the field of corrections.

Cooperation with Vocational Rehabilitation

Another significant program has already become a reality. This is a cooperative agreement between the Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation in the State Department of Education and the Florida Division of Corrections, set up to unite and coordinate the efforts of both agencies in behalf of disabled individuals. There is a large number of inmates with physical and mental

disabilities which constitute a substantial handicap to their return to employment but which are of such a nature that vocational rehabilitation services may reasonably be expected to render them fit to engage in a gainful occupation. These inmates with physical and mental handicaps may or may not be amenable to medical, psychiatric, or surgical treatment; but many are in need of other rehabilitation services such as vocational counseling, training, and placement.

Vocational rehabilitation personnel will also be of great help to us in our new state reception and diagnostic center. This would be an excellent setting for research of many kinds, because we receive here all individuals sentenced to state institutions and then designate the programs which will best meet their needs.

At present we are sending offenders to existing programs which we believe are doing some good, but we don't know. Research hasn't assured us that they are. If we could determine specific needs at the center, we could then direct institutions to establish programs to meet these needs if they are not now in existence.

Research would also be of great assistance to states which are now being given responsibility for county jails. This is an area of need for research if there ever was one.

Attitudes toward Research

It appears to me that we are going to have to take the custodial personnel we now have in our systems and give them training that will help them understand better the problems of inmates and the goals and philosophies of the institution. If we don't have rank-and-file custodial personnel who are interested in the total rehabilitation effort, they can undo everything the researchers and professional people can contribute.

I know that most directors of correctional systems are really interested in making progress. I believe they are interested in having research done in their systems if they understand the contributions it can make to progress of their programs.

Mr. Sharp:

The first point I'd like to make is that it is necessary for the image of the administrator and the image of the researcher to be more clear in each other's mind. For years the researcher has probably thought of the correctional administrator as a hardboiled type comparable to wardens in TV or movies. Even the word "corrections" is misunderstood. The correctional administrator has often viewed the researcher as some impractical, longhaired theoretician, who made little or no contribution to the day-to-day problems of corrections.

Sometimes the attitude toward research has been based on the difficulty of getting studies started. Often the smallest problems are the hardest to solve. The administrator needs help with all types of problems. On other occasions the interpretation of research results has been confusing.

Some Historic Obstacles

A review of the proceedings of the American Congress on Corrections will indicate that research occupied a very isolated and insignificant position for many years. And there was considerable confusion between research and statistics.

For years administrators have had a great deal of difficulty in securing funds for either training or research. In many states it has been impossible to secure funds for these purposes.

Finally, corrections is the last of the human services to get federal attention and funding by federal agencies. First came education, then welfare, then mental health. Now at last there is public interest, and as a result federal interest, in corrections.

If we want to be frank, the impetus has not come from a desire to serve or from intellectual curiosity. It is predicated on fear, fear of what is happening in the streets. I'll buy fear if fear will help us get tools and instruments, if it will help us improve our knowledge and provide methods of improving correctional programs.

Emphases Desired by Administrators Today

What are some of the emphases the correctional administrators would like to see in research? I'm speaking for the field here, since I have had the pleasure of directing under an Office of Law Enforcement Assistance grant a series of seven seminars from one end of the country to the other. The programs were planned jointly with the Correctional Administrators' Association, the Wardens' Association, and the Association of Paroling Authorities.

From these seminars I can testify that administrators do want research. They want research in testing, in evaluating, in demonstrating, and in projecting.

The researcher's interest in investigation that will add to the fund of scientific knowledge about human behavior is fine. I applaud it. But I would like to recommend a short moratorium on basic research if the same effort, skill, and manpower can be used to evaluate and improve programs, to assist people who have the legal responsibility to protect the community and to return offenders to it as constructive citizens.

Granted that in the past there have been obstacles to research in corrections and a lack of communication between researchers and correctional administration. The climate is right today. It is more positive for research than I had ever thought possible.

Here are some of the topics in the institutes I mentioned:

The place of research in correctional systems at the state level.
The place of research in correctional institutions and service agencies.
The role and responsibility of administration in initiating research.

The participants included 155 wardens, 37 state administrators of correctional systems, and 30 or 35 paroling authorities from all over the U. S. I can say with authority that the climate is right for research in corrections. The willingness and the hunger are there.

We need help because institutions of higher learning have not turned out people trained in research in corrections. This is because administrators had no funds to hire such people and thus there was no market for them.

Involving Correctional Personnel

Obviously research is going to be affected by the validity of initial hard data. No effective research can be carried on until we upgrade the training programs for our personnel. The reason is that, unless there is a qualified person or a knowledgeable person involved in the collection of basic data, the research is not valid.

Involvement in research should start with the top administrative level and

should carry down through all staff. Unless you involve staff, they scuttle or skew the results, so that the validity of your findings is zero.

On the other hand, the administrator should be wise enough to make it clear that he doesn't want staff to turn out merely what they think he wants. We have to teach the value of objectivity to correctional personnel.

Another need is an instrument or medium for sharing the findings of research, especially when they will help to improve programs. I say in all kindness that frequently federal agencies which have projects in corrections don't know what other federal agencies are doing. Coordination is long overdue at the federal level, and sharing of results is long overdue in the field.

The Challenge We Face

The current Congressional action and state interest are based on improving services so that recidivism can be reduced, so that offenders can be returned to the community as constructive citizens, so that the streets of our country will be safe. This is the challenge corrections faces today. If we are not able to rise to the occasion, to produce what is so earnestly desired, we will certainly lose the opportunity for public support. We will lose the opportunity to apply and put into effect what is already known and to explore new methods and techniques. If we lose this opportunity, it may not come again for a very long time. Worse still, there is danger that we might drop back into a period of complacency and lack of interest on the part of the public and of corrections itself.

Mr. Fosen:

Let me sum up what appear to me to be the main themes of our panel speakers.

One is that, if corrections is to get more research done, we are going to have to rely heavily on our own personnel, as opposed to assuming that someone from the outside is going to come in and do it for us.

If we must rely on ourselves for research, where are the research personnel to come from? What about personnel for demonstration and evaluation projects?

A third theme voiced here is interest in research which will help in differentiating the needs of correctional clients and evaluating the appropriateness of programs designed to meet these needs.

Linked with this point is the feeling that, as we build up enthusiasm for use of the community, we have not built up a strategy for tapping community resources effectively, particularly in determining what kinds of clients might benefit most from treatment in the community and what kinds of community programs would help them.

As a fifth theme, we need to build an information base from which we can launch evaluation and demonstration programs.

Finally, there is a feeling that now is the time, that this is probably the most appropriate time in history for corrections to move toward evaluation and study of what it is doing.

MANPOWER AND TRAINING IMPLICATIONS OF THE SEMINAR

Rudy Sanfilippo and Jo Wallach

Papers, panel presentations, and discussions during the two-day seminar were directed first to establishing the need for research in correctional rehabilitation and to identifying areas in which such research is most likely to be fruitful. However, it was recognized that efforts to initiate or expand correctional research must deal with ethical, legal, and methodological problems peculiar to correctional settings. Moreover, both the relative lack of research in corrections and the scarcity of research expertise among correctional personnel in general give rise to questions of who should do the needed research and how it should be administered. Throughout the discussions ran concern for ways of producing trained researchers for the correctional field.

It was clear from discussions that several converging factors have produced unprecedented demand for research in correctional rehabilitation. Both the public and the systems to which it gives responsibility for rehabilitating offenders feel the need to know how well they are doing, and hence there is increased emphasis on more accurate assessment of the effectiveness of correctional programs. There is also a growing interest in developing integrated information systems which can form the basis of more accurate social accounting and furnish a foundation for evaluative research. A third factor is the increased availability of public and private funds for the conduct of social research.

Potential Areas for Research

Seminar participants' examination of the rehabilitation aspects of corrections demonstrated that the number of potential areas for research is very large indeed. It was apparent throughout the discussion that many correctional programs have been developed with little or no attention to assessment of the outcomes. Such recent innovations as halfway houses, work-release programs, and pre-release guidance centers, for example, have proliferated around the country without much serious effort being devoted to testing their effectiveness in the correctional process.

With so much to be done, it is difficult to determine the precise points in the correctional process at which scientific inquiry is likely to yield the greatest payoff. However, there appeared to be consensus about the following points.

1. Information systems must be developed which adequately describe the characteristics of the offender population. Very few such systems now exist to provide fundamental information on which specific research programs can be based.
2. Classification instruments are badly needed to provide the basis for differential programming for offenders in order to meet specific needs. For example, screening mechanisms must be developed to identify those offenders who could benefit from special medical-surgical, work training, or remedial education programs.

Mr. Sanfilippo is director and Mrs. Wallach assistant director of the Joint Commission's task force on prospects and perspectives in corrections.

3. Criteria are needed, in addition to reduction of recidivism, by which to assess the effectiveness of specific correctional programs.
4. Clearing-house mechanisms should be provided through public and private sources to disseminate widely the results of research in the correctional field and related areas.
5. Finally, there must be more effective utilization of knowledge generated by evaluative research.

Throughout the discussion of suggested topics for research a number of participants emphasized the need for research programs to take cognizance of offender needs and to help in the identification of obstacles to successful rehabilitation. It was noted that many of these obstacles might well be external to the offender and that greater attention should be paid to social, cultural, physical, and economic variables as potential impediments to rehabilitation.

It was generally agreed that evaluation is especially needed for new programs which:

1. Seek to link institutionalized offenders in more significant ways to the community and its resources;
2. Take into consideration changing job markets, licensing requirements, remedial education, job training, and other factors associated with getting and keeping jobs in a constantly shifting economic sytsem;
3. Focus on community-based correctional programs, which handle the bulk of the correctional population but have been the subject of little research to date; and/or
4. Endeavor to develop cooperative relationships between correctional agencies, labor unions, and private industry in order to promote the rehabilitation of offenders.

Manpower Implications

A number of issues central to correctional manpower and training appeared as recurring themes during the two-day seminar. In the main, these centered around problems attendant upon the recruitment and retention of qualified research personnel and their optimal utilization in correctional settings.

The implementation of research in correctional rehabilitation continues to be impeded by shortages of trained personnel, a lack of totally satisfactory organizational mechanisms linking academic resources to the field, and a paucity of correctional administrators oriented toward research. This latter condition stems from the fact that most correctional administrators today have had little or no academic training in research.

University vs. *Agency-based Research*

Because of the high costs of developing large-scale research operations within an agency framework, there has been a tendency in the correctional field to look to the university as a major resource in meeting research needs. In addition to the cost problem an acute shortage of trained social science researchers has contributed to this inclination to consider academic institutions as the main source of assistance for the design and implementation of evaluative research.

Correctional administrators participating in the seminar, however, reported varying experiences with universities and colleges as resources for research conducted in their agencies. Some reported positive experiences with

academically based researchers, while others pointed to years of frustration in unsuccessful attempts to engage colleges and universities in their states effectively for the purpose of conducting agency-sponsored research in correctional rehabilitation. In those instances where successful collaboration between the academic world and correctional agencies was reported, it was clear that the initiative had generally been taken by the agency and not by an institution of higher education.

In spite of the fact that the record of successful collaboration between universities and correctional agencies has not been impressive, it nonetheless appears likely that the academic community will continue to represent the major source of research assistance for the correctional field. However, in order to maximize the payoff of collaborative ventures between these two quite different kinds of organizations, the correctional administrator and the academic researcher will have to become more attuned to each other's values, needs, language, and political and organizational imperatives. This means that correctional administrators should be more informed about research design, research tools, and ways to interpret and utilize research findings. Conversely, academics need to become more informed about and sensitive to the practical realities of the correctional scene.

Developing Complementary Relationships

Thus the development of comprehensive research programs for a correctional agency dictates that the administrator needs to become more knowledgeable about research matters in order that he may communicate more precisely with researchers as to the desired goals. Traditionally, administrators tend to be more program-centered than research-oriented. As a result they are sometimes ill-equipped to frame problems or questions so that they lend themselves to systematic analysis. Barriers in communication between researchers and correctional practitioners sometimes are created by differences in academic training and by the need to respond to differing publics. For example, the academically based researcher has a primary commitment to the colleagues in his discipline and to the scientific world at large, whereas the correctional administrator has as his main reference groups the legislators and persons in the executive branch of government to whom he is ultimately responsible. In addition, the workings of correctional agencies tend to have high public visibility, and hence there is a tendency to be cautious about conducting research that can produce unfavorable reactions.

Without a careful understanding of the ground rules prior to the launching of agency research, the academic researcher and the practicing administrator can go off on parallel tracks and never reach a point at which a mutuality of interests can be found. But agency-staffed research departments will probably prove to be feasible only for the larger and better-financed correctional systems.

Meeting Shortages of Trained Personnel

On the subject of personnel shortages, it was noted several times that corrections is competing with a number of other governmental services for trained research personnel. In addition, it seems clear that industrial corporations and private research firms are further siphoning off the supply of researchers who might otherwise be available to corrections.

Acknowledged shortages of highly trained social science researchers indicate steps which ought to be considered by the correctional field in the near

future if it is to address seriously the conducting of needed research. Among these would be increased attention to the selection of practical and realistic ways for achieving specific research objectives. For example, some kinds of research activities might best be administered within the agency by existing correctional staff who can be trained in short-term courses provided by universities or private research firms. Persons educated to bachelor's and master's degree levels are likely to possess adequate backgrounds for this kind of training experience. Persons trained in this manner might perform tasks within the agency running from the maintenance of simple information systems to developing research designs for the evaluation of program impact on correctional clients. Thus, the upgrading of persons already within the correctional agency who show interest and aptitude in conducting research can become a major first step in the gradual development of an over-all research strategy for a correctional agency.

Sophisticated research designs and general research consultation for the agency might well call for staffing by Ph.D.'s trained in the behavioral or social sciences. Persons with this level of professional training will be increasingly hard to find. As a result, correctional agencies may have to view the Ph.D.-level researcher as a trainer for less adequately trained personnel and as a consultant on the formulation of complex research designs. This would require a change in the present tendency to feel that only persons trained to the doctoral level are competent to perform research in correctional rehabilitation. An analysis of differentiated research tasks, coupled with shortages of highly trained persons, may cause the field to reconsider its research personnel requirements and staffing patterns.

Organizational and Administrative Arrangements

As a result of these and similar considerations, it becomes clear that correctional agencies will have to develop a number of organizational models designed to facilitate more effective "plugging in" with limited academic, industrial, and other private research resources. Comprehensive research programs for an agency should include consideration of the best administrative arrangements for conducting research as well as attention to the substance of specific research projects. Many projects are designed and implemented with more attention to the problem being studied than to the means by which the study is to be carried out. As a result, much research in the correctional field falls short of its optimal contribution and sometimes leaves a residue of frustration between the researcher and the correctional administrator because of differing expectations as to what was to be accomplished by a study.

In addition to looking to the traditional academic resources for assistance in conducting research, correctional agencies might wish to enlist the talent available at non-profit organizations such as the California-based Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency. Such organizations have a number of obvious advantages over traditional academic resources when they are staffed by persons who are familiar with correctional settings. Oftentimes these organizations have evolved as a result of interest and support from key correctional administrators from the areas served by the research organization. As a result, there is both a receptive climate for conducting research and "reality-based" perceptions of research that is desirable.

All in all, it seems apparent that the correctional agencies will have to employ varied organizational arrangements and resources in order to meet their

increasing research needs. The shortage of highly trained researchers will cause correctional administrators to explore the use of multiple resources — both within the agency and outside it — in order to develop a comprehensive research plan for the agency.

Summary

Differential utilization of persons trained in varied disciplines, with different levels of academic training to perform specific research functions may prove to be the optimal working pattern for the conducting of agency-run research. Where the research under consideration can more adequately be "farmed out," decisions should be reached based on local conditions as to whether it can best be carried out by a college or university, a non-profit research organization, or an industrial firm.

The need for more research in correctional rehabilitation is clear. Favorable administrative climates for the conducting of evaluative research must be created and sustained. Well-conceived research programs must be developed along with realistic staffing patterns. In addition, it is imperative that colleges and universities take greater responsibility for lending their assistance to the action agency. Collaborative ventures between the academic world and the field of correctional practice can operate to the benefit of both when realistic expectations and operational ground rules are established and observed.

ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

NATHAN ED ACREE
Executive Secretary
General Research Study Section
Division of Research and Demonstrations
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration
Washington, D. C.

WILLIAM T. ADAMS
Associate Director
Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training
Washington, D. C.

MYRL E. ALEXANDER
Director
U. S. Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D. C.

JOHN R. BARRY
Research Consultant
Georgia Office of Vocational Rehabilitation
Atlanta, Ga.

DILL D. BECKMAN
Director
South Carolina Vocational Rehabilitation Department
Columbia, S. C.

PERCY B. BELL
Director
Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program
Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Seattle, Wash

GEORGE BETO
Director
Texas Department of Corrections
Huntsville, Texas

JAMES R. BURRESS
Associate Regional Representative
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Region VIII
Denver, Colo.

JOHN P. CONRAD
Chief of Research
U.S. Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D. C.

MILTON K. DAVIS
Research Director
Alcoholic Offender Rehabilitation Project
Portland, Ore.

RICHARD C. ERICSON
Project Coordinator
Minneapolis Rehabilitation Center
Minneapolis, Minn.

WILLIAM E. FLANIGAN
Executive Secretary
National Advisory Council on Correctional Manpower and Training
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration
Washington, D. C.

ROBERT H. FOSEN
Research Director
Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training
Washington, D. C.

GILBERT GEIS
Professor of Sociology
California State College
Los Angeles, Calif.

DON M. GOTTFREDSON
Director
Research Center
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
Davis, Calif.

GARRETT HEYNS
Executive Director
Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training
Washington, D. C.

MARGARET E. HOFFMAN
Chief
Social Services and Corrections Personnel Section
Continuing Education Branch
Division of Manpower and Training Programs
National Institute of Mental Health
Chevy Chase, Md.

PETER P. LEJINS
Professor of Sociology
University of Maryland
College Park, Md.

GEORGE A. LETCHWORTH
Research Specialist
Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Oklahoma City, Okla.

WALLACE MANDELL
Director
Wakoff Research Center
Staten Island, N. Y.

MERLYN MATTHEWS
Research Director
Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program
Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Seattle, Wash.

ROSLYN G. McDONALD
Deputy Director
Research and Planning
New York State Division for Youth
New York, N. Y.

RICHARD A. McGEE
President
Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency
Sacramento, Calif.

GEORGE F. McGRATH
Commissioner
Department of Correction, City of New York
New York, N. Y.

BEN S. MEEKER
Chief U. S. Probation Officer
Chicago, Ill.

J. ELDON MINCKS
Chief U. S. Probation Officer
Seattle, Wash.

H. G. MOELLER
Assistant Director
Community Service
U. S. Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D. C.

BARBARA MORIARTY
Administrative Assistant
General Research Study Section
Division of Research and Demonstration
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration
Washington, D. C.

RUSSELL G. OSWALD
Chairman
New York State Parole Board
Albany, N. Y.

CLAUDE C. PANGBORN
Program Observer
Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program
Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Seattle, Wash.

GLENN C. PETTY
Assistant Chief of Probation
Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts
Washington, D. C.

KENNETH POLK
Associate Professor of Sociology
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

RUDY SANFILIPPO
Task Force Director
Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training
Washington, D. C.

E. PRESTON SHARP
General Secretary
American Correctional Association
Washington, D. C.

CLARENCE C. SHERWOOD
Director of Research
Department of Correction, City of New York
New York, N. Y.

MARY E. SWITZER
Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration
Washington, D. C.

JOHN A. TROIKE
Chairman
Illinois Youth Commission
Springfield, Ill.

WILLIAM USDANE
Chief
Division of Research and Demonstrations
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration
Washington, D. C.

LOUIE L. WAINWRIGHT
Director
Florida Division of Corrections
Tallahassee, Fla.

GLEN K. WALLACE
Director
Juvenile Behavior Program
State Department of Education
Oklahoma City, Okla.

JO WALLACH
Assistant Task Force Director
Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training
Washington, D. C.

JAMES A. WEST
Assistant Director
Oklahoma Vocational Rehabilitation Division
Oklahoma City, Okla.

E. B. WHITTEN
Executive Director
National Rehabilitation Association
Washington, D. C.

THE COMMISSION

James V. Bennett, *President*

E. B. Whitten
Vice-President

E. Preston Sharp
Secretary-Treasurer

Board of Directors

Milton G. Rector
Chairman

Peter P. Lejins
Vice-Chairman

James V. Bennett
Daniel Blain
Charles B. Brink
Raymond Feldman
Dale B. Harris
Elmer H. Johnson
Richard A. McGee
Russell G. Oswald
Arnulf M. Pins
Walter C. Reckless
Howard P. Rome
Mrs. Thomas Scales
Clyde E. Sullivan
Randolph E. Wise
Luther W. Youngdahl

Officers of the Membership

Ellis C. MacDougall
Chairman

Earl H. Hanson
Vice-Chairman

THE STAFF

Garrett Heyns
Executive Director

William T. Adams
Associate Director

Edward T. Magoffin, Jr.
Controller, Director of Legal Studies

Roma K. McNickle
Editor

Research Director

Robert H. Fosen

Task Force Directors

Benjamin Frank
John J. Galvin
Merritt Gilman
William F. Meredith
Rudy Sanfilippo
Keith A. Stubblefield

Assistant Directors

Steve Bulfinch
Ralph M. Gutekunst, Jr.
Loren Karacki
Alice Maxwell
Nick Pappas
Dale Sechrest
Jo Wallach
Adrianne W. Weir